

to gain the attention and secure the active interest of TOM MARTIN.

The conflict ended, he returned to his studies, but after two years of work at the University of Virginia, upon the death of his father, he was forced to leave school and take upon himself the responsibility of a large family. Although engaged in mercantile business he studied law at home and was admitted to the bar in 1869. His perseverance, industry, and ability soon established him among the leaders of his profession, and he was recognized as an earnest, conscientious, and fearless practitioner. He continued the practice of his profession until 1893. Up to that time he had taken interest in politics, but had always refused to stand for public office. His first election to office was when he entered the United States Senate. From this time his life was an open book, and he lived it cleanly before the public as he had lived privately. By sheer force of will and merit he had risen out of his struggles as a poor young boy to become a Senator from Virginia in the Senate of the United States. In the Senate the qualities which had earned him the position with the people of Virginia were at once recognized by his associates. He was possessed of a sound, clear, discriminating judgment and his attitude on all public questions was open, candid, and decisive. Though he carefully weighed all matters of public interest, yet he was quick to arrive at conclusions and energetic in putting them into effect. His high moral and intellectual integrity commanded the respect and trust of Senators on both sides of the Chamber. He was intolerant of hypocrisy and deception in whatever guise they might appear. These were regarded by him as the refuge of the demagogue and coward. No man who knew Senator MARTIN, whether friend or foe, ever doubted his courage or questioned his openness or candor. He was known for his untiring devotion and fidelity to duty. When the time came to elect the floor leader of his party, in one of the most crucial periods of the country's history, the choice fell on Senator MARTIN, and fearlessly and ably he performed the task. He gave himself wholeheartedly to the work and became a figure of national prominence, looked upon by the country at large with confidence and trust.

But his labors were too strenuous and he had spent himself too freely in the service of the Nation. The motto of the old Romans "Est gloria pro patria mori" applies as well to those who give their lives beyond their physical strength in the service of their country in civil life as to those who die on field of battle in the clash of arms. In the years to come history will recognize this service on the part of many who receive not the honors accorded military heroes and the tribute to which their services entitle them.

The life of Senator MARTIN was particularly a life of service. A compelling desire to render the greatest possible service to his people, his State, and his country impelled him to devote his entire time and talents to their interests, and he died poor in this world's goods, but rich in the affections and love of the people of Virginia whom he so well served.

As he served publicly so did he serve his friends. An appeal from a man to whom he gave his friendship met with a speedy, hearty response. Loyalty to his friends was, perhaps, his very strongest characteristic. His service was given to those lacking influence and power as quickly as to the persons of importance and prominence, even if not more quickly. He dearly loved to serve the man in humble circumstances, who was unable to hire or secure independent aid. Studious, faithful adherence to duty in the service of his people and his friends was his daily watchword. This was largely responsible for the deep affection in which he was universally held.

I am proud to claim him as my friend and appreciative of the opportunity to submit this tribute of affection and esteem to his memory. His death was a great loss to the Nation and particularly to the State of Virginia, which he so devotedly loved, and when the roll is called of Virginia's distinguished sons, there will undoubtedly be heard reverberating from the hills of Albemarle the honored name of THOMAS STAPLES MARTIN.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, Senator MARTIN entered the Senate at the same time I entered the House, but it was many years before I had even a speaking acquaintance with him. After he became chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, I frequently met him on conference committees of the Senate and the House on appropriation bills, and gradually came to know him intimately, for I think there is no legislative proceeding where the real characteristics of an individual show themselves so clearly and truthfully as in meetings of conference committees. It is a small body, meeting in secret, with no

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to print remarks and thereby prevent the free expression of opinions, the questions discussed are important and intrinsically interesting, and men's minds meet in a close but generally friendly grapple which is stimulating and enjoyable.

In this arena I came to know Senator MARTIN intimately, and my increasing acquaintance increased my admiration and friendship for him. He was intelligent and able, and always knew thoroughly the questions discussed, and although sometimes a little hasty and even peppery in his temper, yet he was so fair and just and wise and high-purposed that he was a delightful colleague to deal with whether you agreed or differed with his opinions. He viewed questions from a high plane, and looked at the general and not the special interests affected; was frank and honest and singularly free from the selfish and stubborn spirit which sometimes leads conferees to seek their own ends at the expense of the public welfare. It was not his characteristic to dicker or trade, but frankly to state his opinions and urge his views, and yet he recognized that compromises are often inevitable and he was fair toward his opponents and not greedy for himself. I became greatly attached to him, and mourn deeply the loss of a wise and patriotic legislator and a warm-hearted, high-spirited, affectionate friend.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and public service of the late Senator MARTIN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTAGUE). Without objection it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with the terms of the resolution heretofore adopted, the House will now stand adjourned.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Monday, February 14, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 14, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., the Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the privilege of facing another week with its responsibilities. Help us to be equal to every task and to find ourselves cooperating with Thee in Thy purposes. Realize to us constantly that Thou art our all-sufficiency. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, February 9, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ACCOUNTS OF TREASURER OF UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 389).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$454.95, required by the Treasury Department to enable its proper accounting officers to credit said sum in the accounts of the Treasury of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY ACCOUNTING OFFICERS OF TREASURY (S. DOC. NO. 386).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS AGAINST GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (S. DOC. NO. 388).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the district courts of the United States and requesting an appropriation to pay them, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Montana, which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "A joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana in the Congress of the United States to lend their support to the passage of the bill now pending before Congress known as the Chamberlain-McArthur bill, relating to the appropriation of additional sums of money for extending Federal aid in the construction of post roads, and for other purposes," enacted by the seventeenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by Joseph M. Dixon, governor of said State, on the 8th day of February, 1921.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 9th day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.
By CLIFFORD L. WALKER,
Deputy.

Senate joint resolution 4, introduced by Mr. Siegfried.

A joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana in the Congress of the United States to lend their support to the passage of the bill now pending before Congress known as the Chamberlain-McArthur bill, relating to the appropriation of additional sums of money for extending Federal aid in the construction of post roads, and for other purposes.

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States certain bills for the appropriating of additional sums for Federal aid in the construction of post roads, and for other purposes, and which said bills are designated the Chamberlain-McArthur bill; and Whereas the method of expending moneys of the United States for the construction of post roads in the United States and within the boundaries of the State of Montana is upon a basis of equal amounts of money being expended by the Federal Government, together with the State and county, which method has resulted in burdening the several counties of the State of Montana to a greater extent than is deemed just and proportionate; and

Whereas the allotment of money made by the Federal Government under the existing laws for Federal aid in the construction of road projects within the State of Montana has not at the present time been used because and on account of the inability of the State of Montana and the several counties therein to raise by appropriation an amount sufficient to equal the requirements of the present existing Federal aid act; and

Whereas the Chamberlain-McArthur bill, now before Congress, will afford additional sums of money for the construction of highways within the State of Montana, as well as in the forest reserves, Indian reservations, and across the Government lands still unoccupied within the State of Montana; and

Whereas the provisions of the Chamberlain-McArthur bill will aid and assist the several counties of the State of Montana and the State itself in meeting the requirements of the Federal-aid project for construction of roads and highways: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Seventeenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we urge upon the honorable Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Montana that they use all honorable means for the passage of the Chamberlain-McArthur Act, to the end that the State of Montana may be aided and assisted in the construction of roads and highways in proportion to the amount of lands owned by the State with those owned by the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the State of Montana to each of the honorable Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

NELSON STORY, JR.,
President of the Senate.
PERCY F. DODDS,
Speaker pro tempore of the House.

Approved February 8, 1921.

JOS. M. DIXON,
Governor.

Filed February 9, 1921, at 9.15 o'clock a. m.

C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented memorials of William J. Dolan, Mrs. M. J. Dolan, and Patrick Dolan, of Libby; Mr. and Mrs. M. J. Devitt, of Libby; W. E. Greene, of Libby; Mr. and Mrs. John Reedy, sr.; Pat Reedy, of Libby; Mary E. Wall; Mrs. J. R. Wall; sundry citizens of Butte; and the Women's Catholic Order of Foresters, St. Mary's Court No. 579, of Cascade County; all in the State of Montana, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Park County, Mont., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation increasing the duty on wrapper tobacco, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BALL presented memorials of Eleanor Lawson, Ella W. Higgins, and Eleanor C. Hughes, all of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of Ralph A. Talbot, of Bridgeport; Geo. D. Hornbeck, of Chester; Frances A. Hurd, of South Norwalk; Georgie B. Child, of Stamford; Mrs. Elizabeth Morrison, of Norwalk; and Robert V. Lewis, Mary P. Lewis, and Emily A. Lewis, of Waterbury; all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the promotion of physical training, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hartford; Ladies of Charity, of Hartford; P. L. Manfredi, of Ansonia; Unity Council, No. 37, Knights of Columbus, of Torrington; Jennie McNamara, State regent of Daughters of Isabella, of Bridgeport; Mabel A. Laney, grand regent, Court Reina Christian, No. 51, Daughters of Isabella, of Bridgeport; George H. Harold, of New Haven; The Sodality of the Children of Mary, of Windsor Locks; St. Michael's Branch, No. 707, Ladies Catholic Benevolent Association, of Pawcatuck; Mary E. Hart, president of Mount St. Joseph Alumnae Association, of Stamford; and Court Laurel, Daughters of Castile, of South Norwalk; all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Corporal Frank Coyle Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, of Waterbury, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for establishment of 14 regional offices of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, etc.; providing for retirement of disabled emergency officers and Reserve Corps officers on same basis as granted Regular Army officers; providing medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, Army and Navy nurses (male and female), etc.; providing for the consolidation of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Rehabilitation Division of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and United States Public Health Service under one head; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the American Legion, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, Army and Navy nurses (male and female), etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the Derby Business Men's Association, of Derby, and the American Legion, Stratford Post, No. 42, of Stratford, both in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against commercializing the national parks, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Lacroix Murdock Post, No. 585, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Meriden, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation paying a bonus to ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of Benjamin Franklin Council of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of New Haven, Conn., protesting against the deportation of Lord Mayor Donal J. O'Callaghan, of Cork, Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WOLCOTT presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Farm Bureau Federation, at Lincoln, Nebr., favoring an appropriation to carry on the work of collecting, tabulating, and disseminating statistical information vital to the farmer, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of Coffey County Pomona Grange, of Burlington, Kans., favoring legislation to strengthen the Federal farm-loan act, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented resolutions of Lake View Local Union No. 659, of Lake City, Ark., and the Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America, of St. John, Kans., favoring legislation to prohibit speculation in grain products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Cincinnati and sundry citizens of Reading, both in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Apple Creek, Ohio, favoring legislation restricting the immigration of aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PHELAN presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of California, which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION,
Assembly Chamber, January 24, 1921.

To the honorable the Representatives and Senators in the United States Congress from the State of California and to each of the members of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate:

Pursuant to the provisions of assembly joint resolution 16, adopted by the Legislature of the State of California at the forty-fourth session, I am sending you herewith a copy thereof, reading as follows:

"Assembly joint resolution No. 16, by Assemblyman Heisinger, of the fifty-second district, relative to imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies.

"Whereas agriculture is the basic industry of our country; and
"Whereas the American farmers have just harvested one of the largest crops in the history of the Nation; and

"Whereas large volumes of foreign products are now being imported from foreign countries due to unprecedented world-wide economic conditions; and

"Whereas many lines of this great agricultural industry are now seriously menaced by this situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and assembly, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes Congress to enact the emergency tariff measure (H. R. 15275) now before that body, imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products; and be it further

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and are hereby, urged and requested to use all honorable means to secure the adoption of this measure; and be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of these resolutions be transmitted to each of our Representatives and Senators in Congress and to each of the members of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate.

"HENRY W. WRIGHT,
"Speaker of the Assembly.

"C. C. YOUNG,
"President of the Senate.

"MARTIN C. MADSEN,
"Private Secretary to the Governor.

"FRANK C. JORDAN,
"Secretary of State."

And hereby certify that the same was duly presented to the governor of the State of California on January 24, 1921.

JEROME B. KAVANAUGH,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. PHELAN presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of California, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION,
Assembly Chamber, January 24, 1921.

To the honorable the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, to the governor of each of the States of the United States, to the members of the respective Committees of Mines and Mining of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of California:

Pursuant to the provisions of assembly joint resolution No. 2, adopted by the Legislature of the State of California at the forty-fourth session, I am sending you herewith a copy thereof, reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 14. Assembly joint resolution No. 2, by Assemblyman McGee, of the sixteenth district, relative to the indorsement of the McFadden bill, to conserve the gold ore resources of the Nation in the interest of monetary security.

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill known as the 'McFadden bill,' H. R. 13201, which said bill has for its objects the following:

"1. To prevent a still further and more rapid decline in the production of gold in the United States, which has already decreased from 101,000,000 in 1915 to an estimated production of less than 50,000,000 in 1920;

"2. To conserve the known gold-ore resources of the United States from entire loss, due to the continued shutting down of the gold mines and the flooding and caving of ore incident thereto; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has adopted gold as the unit of monetary measurement and the standard medium of exchange; and

"Whereas the present condition of the gold-mining industry of the United States constitutes a menace to the gold standard and in the interest of the monetary security of the Nation demands an immediate remedy; and

"Whereas conditions confronting the gold-mining industry in California, the premier gold-mining State of the Union, call for the prompt and early enactment of the legislation proposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly and senate, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California, at its forty-fourth session, urges upon the Congress of the United States the adoption of said McFadden bill and the imperative need for the immediate enactment of the same; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this joint resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, to the governor of each of the States of the United States, to the members of the respective Committees of Mines and Mining of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of California.

"HENRY W. WRIGHT,
"Speaker of the Assembly.

"C. C. YOUNG,
"President of the Senate.

"MARTIN C. MADSEN,
"Private Secretary to the Governor.

"FRANK C. JORDAN,
"Secretary of State."

And hereby certify that the same was duly filed with the secretary of state on January 24, 1921.

JEROME B. KAVANAUGH,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. PHELAN presented two joint resolutions of the Legislature of California, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION,
Assembly Chamber, January 24, 1921.

To the honorable the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California, to the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and to the members of the United States Tariff Commission:

Pursuant to the provisions of assembly joint resolution No. 18, adopted by the Legislature of the State of California at the forty-fourth session, I am sending you herewith a copy thereof reading as follows:

"Assembly joint resolution No. 18, by Assemblyman Cummings and Miss Broughton, relative to the protection of the dairy industry.

"Whereas the dairy industry of California is one of the most important industries of the country and producing annually many millions of dollars; and

"Whereas butter is being imported in enormous quantities into our local markets; and

"Whereas the dairy industry of California now faces a grave menace which can not be avoided unless such protection is granted as will afford an adequate safeguard to the investments of American dairymen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly and senate, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes Congress to adopt such measures as will afford adequate and proper protection to the dairy industry of this country: And be it further

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, urged and requested to use all honorable means to secure the adoption of such a tariff: And be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of these resolutions be transmitted to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to each of the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and to the members of the United States Tariff Commission now meeting at Washington.

"HENRY W. WRIGHT,
"Speaker of the Assembly.

"C. C. YOUNG,
"President of the Senate.

"MARTIN C. MADSEN,
"Private Secretary to the Governor.

"FRANK C. JORDAN,
"Secretary of State."

And hereby certify that the same was duly presented to the governor of the State of California on January 24, 1921.

JEROME B. KAVANAUGH,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION,
Assembly Chamber, January 22, 1921.

To the honorable the President of the United States, the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California, including those to assume office on March 4, 1921:

Pursuant to the provisions of assembly joint resolution 9, adopted by the Legislature of the State of California at the forty-fourth session, I am sending you herewith a copy thereof, reading as follows:

"Assembly joint resolution 9, by Assemblymen Brooks, Christian, and Parkinson, relative to the passage of the World War adjusted compensation act.

"Whereas the Nation's debt to the veterans of the World War is unquestionably recognized by a grateful people for valiant services rendered; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill known as the World War adjusted compensation act (H. R. 14157); and

"Whereas it appears that the consensus of opinion of the veterans of the World War is overwhelmingly in favor of this bill in preference to any other solution of the problem of rendering to the veterans a part of their just due; and

"Whereas a failure to act promptly will in many instances be the equivalent of a denial of justice: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly and the senate jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California memorialize the Congress of the United States for the passage of the said World War adjusted compensation act at an early date; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California be requested to use honorable means to secure the action desired in this matter for the purposes aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California, including those to assume office on March 4, 1921.

"HENRY W. WRIGHT,
"Speaker of the Assembly.

"C. C. YOUNG,
"President of the Senate.

"MARTIN C. MADSEN,
"Private Secretary to the Governor.

"FRANK C. JORDAN,
"Secretary of State."

And hereby certify that the same was duly presented to the governor of the State of California on January 22, 1921.

JEROME B. KAVANAUGH,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3695) for the relief of the Stevens Institute of Technology, of Hoboken, N. J., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 785) thereon.

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12396) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915, reported it favorably without amendment and submitted a report (No. 788) thereon.

CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. CURTIS. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12157) to amend act of Congress approved June 30, 1913.

Mr. GORE. I ask for the present consideration of the bill just reported.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to know what the bill is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved June 30, 1913 (38 Stat. L.), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reserve and set aside four sections of the unallotted lands belonging to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, for the purpose of providing land on which to build a sanatorium or sanatoria for the benefit of the Indians, is hereby amended to provide that the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell at the original appraisement value and convey to the State of Oklahoma a portion of this reserve not now used or needed for the proper operation of the tribal institutions thereon, and as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the State health commissioner, not to exceed one section of said reserve, for the purpose of providing a site on which the State shall build sanatoria for the treatment of both white and Indian citizens of said State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CURTIS. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 15011) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to offer for sale the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, State of Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. It is a local bill, and I think it will take only a moment to dispose of it.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if there is a favorable report on the bill from the department.

Mr. GORE. I am not certain as to this particular bill, but a similar bill has been repeatedly passed. It is simply pursuing a policy long ago agreed upon, but some of the lands would not sell at the amount of the appraisal. The appraisal was too high and the land was left on hand. The bill merely provides for a reappraisal and reoffering for sale. We have passed a similar bill two or three times for the same purpose. In this case the reappraisal happened to be so high on the lands that they would not sell. There is no new policy involved. It is simply winding up an affair that we have undertaken two or three times before to wind up.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not very wise to allow bills to pass in this way, but I shall offer no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to reappraise and sell the remainder of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, in the State of Oklahoma, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him in accordance with the act of February 8, 1918 (U. S. Stat. L., 40, p. 433), as to terms and conditions of payment; and the unexpended balance appropriated by said act of February 8, 1918, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribal funds for this purpose.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably without amendment, from the Committee on Commerce, the bill (H. R. 13606) granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River, and I submit a report (No. 781) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of St. Paul, Minn., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the point where Sibley Street, in said city of St. Paul, crosses the Mississippi River in the county of Ramsey, in the State of Minnesota, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HUDSON RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 15131) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Troy, in the county of Rensselaer, and the city of Cohoes, in the county of Albany, State of New York, and I submit a report (No. 782) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of New York, the cities of Troy and Cohoes and the counties of Rensselaer and Albany, their successors and assigns be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Hudson River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between the city of Troy, in the county of Rensselaer, and the city of Cohoes in the county of Albany, in the State of New York, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TUG FORK OF BIG SANDY RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 15271) granting consent of Congress to the Majestic Collieries Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River, at or near Cedar, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky., and I submit a report (No. 783) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Majestic Collieries Co., of Majestic, Ky., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Cedar, the county of Mingo, State of West Virginia, to the Kentucky side, in the county of Pike, in the State of Kentucky, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 15750) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River, in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Burnham, in said county, and I submit a report (No. 784) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Cook, a civil division of the State incorporated and organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Little Calumet River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the village of Burnham, in Cook County, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BAYOU CODOURIE, LA.

Mr. RANDELL. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 4582) to declare Bayou Coudrie nonnavigable from its source to its junction with Bayou Chicot, and I submit a report (No. 787) thereon. This is a unanimous report of the Committee on Com-

merce, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That Bayou Cocodrie, from its source to its junction with Bayou Chicot, in the State of Louisiana, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the laws enacted by the Congress for the preservation and protection of such waters.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

M. H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. KNOX, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred Senate resolution 445, submitted by Mr. SMITH of Arizona February 11, 1921, authorizing and directing the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate to place upon the roll of messengers the name of M. H. Humphrey, under Senate resolution 72, July 14, 1911, reported it favorably without amendment, submitted a report thereon (No. 786), and moved that it be referred (with the accompanying papers) to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5010) granting an increase of pension to John Hiet (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 5011) authorizing Rolph Navigation & Coal Co. to sue the United States to recover damages resulting from collisions; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for the eradication of the codling moth, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. NORRIS submitted an amendment providing that the Secretary of War transfer to the Department of Agriculture for use in the improvement of highways and roads certain war materials, machinery, and equipment pertaining to the Military Establishment out of the reserve stocks, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CAPPER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed, as follows:

On page 14, line 25, strike out the numerals "\$3,600," and in lieu thereof insert the following: "\$7,500; secretary, \$2,500; traveling expenses, \$2,500"; and on page 15, line 5, to strike out the numerals "\$16,600," and in lieu thereof to insert the numerals "\$25,500."

AMENDMENT OF PENAL LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. KNOX submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12161) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 1134), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS DUE BY COMMISSIONER OF LIGHTHOUSES (S. DOC. NO. 337).

Mr. JONES of Washington. I find that there is a communication from the Treasury Department with reference to an audited claim under the river and harbor bill which went to the Commerce Committee. It should properly go to the Appropriations Committee. I therefore ask that the Committee on Commerce may be discharged from the consideration of the communication, and that it may be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

TRAFFIC AGREEMENTS, ETC.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 449), which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and it is hereby requested to furnish to the Senate full information regarding all traffic agreements, arrangements, or understandings between the eastern trunk-line railroads and the foreign-flag steamship lines.

GREAT FALLS WATER-POWER PROJECT.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have here a report from Maj. M. C. Tyler, of the Corps of Engineers, made to the Water

Power Commission on the Great Falls power project and the proposition to increase the water supply of the District of Columbia. I ask to have it referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view of having it printed as a Senate document. Before I offer the resolution I wish to read a summary of the conclusions reached in this report. It is as follows:

(a) A comprehensive development of the Potomac River for power purposes by means of power dams in the main river and storage reservoirs on certain of the larger tributaries is economically feasible, and continuous power thereby can be generated at a cost, per kilowatt hour approximately 50 per cent less than that for power generated by steam, if the entire output of the hydroelectric plants can be marketed.

(b) Further study of storage possibilities is desirable. Gauging stations should be established and maintained at the reservoir dam sites on the Great Cacapon, Shenandoah, North Fork of the Shenandoah, and South Branch of the Potomac, and large-scale surveys of the reservoir sites on the Great Cacapon River and the Potomac River above Great Falls should be made. Prior to the adoption of any reservoir project thorough borings accurately to determine dam foundation conditions should be made.

(c) The complete development for power purposes of the Potomac River between Brunswick, Md., and tidewater will be best accomplished by two power dams, one at the District of Columbia line, with pool at elevation 115 feet above mean sea level, and the other immediately above Great Falls, with pool at about 215 feet above mean sea level.

(d) The power plant outlined in project No. 3, House Document No. 1400, Sixty-second Congress, third session, modified along the general lines indicated herein is a unit of the larger development.

(e) Neither the power plant outlined in project No. 3, House Document No. 1400, Sixty-second Congress, third session, nor that power plant modified as outlined herein can be considered as economically justifiable at present interest rates and construction costs if the hydroelectric power is to be supplied only to the Federal and District of Columbia Governments.

(f) With coal costing \$7 per ton f. o. b. car at steam stations in the District of Columbia, the power plant outlined in project No. 3, House Document No. 1400, Sixty-second Congress, third session, modified along the general lines indicated herein, if operated in conjunction with the central steam stations and distribution systems of the public utilities of the District of Columbia, will deliver power at substations 2 mills per kilowatt hour cheaper than the production cost at steam station. switchboard, will earn interest at 6 per cent on capital investment, pay depreciation, maintenance and operation charges, return the capital invested in 30 years, and conserve annually approximately 240,000 tons of coal. With coal costing \$5.50 per ton f. o. b. car at steam stations, the cost (including interest, depreciation, maintenance, operation, and sinking fund) of hydroelectric power delivered at substations will equal the savings at the steam stations resulting from its use.

(g) No economy will result from combining the power plant outlined in project No. 3, House Document No. 1400, Sixty-second Congress, third session, with the increase of the water supply of the District of Columbia.

(h) Additional facilities for supplying water to the District of Columbia are an imperative necessity as insurance against interruption of service. The quantity of water now carried by the existing supply system is so large that proper maintenance work on conduits and tunnels can not be done until a new supply line is put in operation. If new construction is deferred, it should be with full knowledge of the risk involved.

(i) The project hereinafter described and designated as "Potomac project B," including a new conduit from Great Falls to Dalecarlia Reservoir, a new filtration plant on the Dalecarlia Reservation, and proper connections to the first, second, and third high areas of the distribution system can be much more speedily completed than any other satisfactory project. It requires the purchase of practically no additional land. It is by far the cheapest in first cost. It will furnish water more economically for many years to come than any other project. For these reasons it is recommended for adoption and prompt completion.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask that the resolution which I offer, together with the report of Maj. Tyler, be referred to the Committee on Printing, with the view of having the report made a Senate document.

There being no objection, the report and the following resolution (S. Res. 450) were referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the report of Maj. M. C. Tyler, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 10, 1921, on investigation of Great Falls water-power project and plans and estimates of cost to secure an increased and adequate water supply for the District of Columbia, be printed as a public document.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR SURG. GEN. GORGAS.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, on the night of January 16, 1921, at the Pan American Building in this city, memorial services in honor of the late Gen. Gorgas were held under the auspices of the Southern Society of Washington, D. C. The eloquent and splendid tributes paid to Gen. Gorgas by Cabinet officers, other officials of the Government, and others, as well as by officials and diplomats of foreign countries, are worthy to be published and preserved in the archives of the Nation that he served so faithfully and well. It was his splendid skill and genius that freed the American Continent from the scourge and curse of yellow fever. He led in driving this yellow plague from the lakes and lagoons of Louisiana, and he destroyed it in the swamps and marshes of the Panama Canal Zone. He has rendered signal service not only to the people of America but to mankind the world over. This great man, born at Mobile, Ala., became not only a national but an international character.

Mr. President, to the end that the speeches and messages to which I have referred may be printed and preserved, I ask

unanimous consent that they be ordered printed in the form of a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent to take up the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. It will take but a few minutes to dispose of it, I think.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15543) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the first question that comes before the Senate this morning is the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to suspend the rule with reference to the pending amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the roll be called.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us have a quorum first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calling of the roll will dispose of that question.

Mr. SMOOT. There are some Senators who perhaps could not reach the Chamber within that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Glass	Lodge	Smith, Md.
Ball	Gooding	McCumber	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Gore	McKellar	Smoot
Brandeggee	Gronna	McLean	Spencer
Calder	Hale	Moses	Stanley
Capper	Harris	Myers	Sterling
Chamberlain	Harrison	New	Sutherland
Colt	Hedlin	Overman	Swanson
Culberson	Henderson	Phelan	Thomas
Curtis	Hitchcock	Phipps	Trammell
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Underwood
Dillingham	Kellogg	Pointexter	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Kendrick	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Kenyon	Ransdell	Warren
Fletcher	Keyes	Sheppard	Williams
France	King	Shields	Willis
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Simmons	
Gay	Knox	Smith, Ariz.	
Gerry	La Follette	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. NEW. I was requested to announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] are absent in attendance upon a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and the pending question is on the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, is the pending motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish the attention of the Senate for just a moment. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate inserted in the pending bill a provision allowing the \$240 bonus to certain employees of the Government. A similar amendment was offered in the other House but went out on a point of order. The question now is as to whether or not we shall allow the \$240 bonus to certain employees in the navy yards of the United States. The Secretary of the Navy reports those employees to-day are receiving as high wages and perhaps higher wages than are employees who are engaged in similar work anywhere in the United States, and that the wage is \$240 higher than the wage that would be allowed by the board which was created to regulate the wages of such employees. The original House provisions affecting these employees were just the same as those which were reported from the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Let me read the original House provision:

The provisions of this section shall not apply to the following: Employees paid from the postal revenues and sums which may be advanced from the Treasury to meet deficiencies in the postal revenues; employees whose pay is adjustable from time to time through wage boards or similar authority to accord with the commercial rates paid locally for the same class of service.

When the wages of these employees are advanced, the boards are all right, but if the wages are to be decreased then they are all wrong.

As I have previously stated, the bonus provision as affecting navy yard employees was put into the bill a year ago for the very purpose of making good what those employees thought they had lost during the two preceding years. Now it is proposed that they shall receive a wage based upon the wage which

is paid employees who perform similar work in private industries.

Mr. HALE. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. If the wage board shall find that we are dealing unfairly with these men in regard to the bonus, will they not have a right to increase their wages at any time if they see fit to do so?

Mr. SMOOT. They will.

Mr. HALE. So the remedy is with the wage board?

Mr. SMOOT. Absolutely. It was stated here on Saturday last that the wage board would not meet until October, and, therefore, the navy yard employees, if the committee provision is inserted in the bill, would lose the bonus from July 1 until the board shall meet; but the wage board may meet at any time they wish to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. CALDER. In reference to the statement of the Senator from Utah just made, that the wage board may meet at any time they wish, I desire to ask, could not that board, having in mind the bonus, meet on the 1st of July and reduce the pay of these men if they deemed it was proper to do so?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; they could reduce their wages, Mr. President, but that is not what the men want and they would not be content with that at all.

Mr. McLEAN. What compensation do these men now receive? What is the character of their service?

Mr. SMOOT. They are the mechanics in the navy yard and are receiving 93½ cents an hour. They are receiving that amount per hour, and that compensation is based upon the wages which are paid to employees in private industrial establishments performing the same character of work. The men who are employed in industries outside of the Government, however, are not allowed the gratuities which Government employees at the navy yards are allowed. The Government employees have a leave of absence of 30 days, they have seven holidays, with no work, for which they are paid; they have Saturday afternoons, amounting to 6½ days each year; they have a sick leave of a minimum of 15 days, or a total in every year of 58½ days; yet they are paid for the full 12 months.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Utah if that would not, on an average for the actual work done, amount to from \$1.05 to \$1.07 an hour for the actual hours during which those employees are engaged?

Mr. SMOOT. It is 10 months as against 12 months, which makes a 20 per cent difference, or an increase of 20 per cent, comparing 10 months with 12 months, as the Senator from North Dakota may readily see.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from an employee of the New York Navy Yard, which indicates that the leaves and allowances to the employees of the New York Navy Yard amount to between 50 and 60 per cent of the overhead charges in that yard.

Mr. CALDER. Is the letter which the Senator is going to read from the department or is it from an employee?

Mr. SMOOT. It is written by an official of the navy yard who knows what he is talking about. I will show the letter to the Senator from New York if he desires. I will simply say that the Senator will admit the statements which are contained in the letter if he knew the writer.

Mr. CALDER. I should like to investigate the matter before I admit them.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator will have confidence in the man who has written this letter.

Mr. President, the proposition is to suspend the rules in order that the Senate of the United States may vote to insert the \$240 bonus for these employees.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah whether, if the navy-yard employees are allowed the \$240 bonus, it would not be a discrimination against the other Government employees?

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all; no more than there is a discrimination in the case of any other lump-sum appropriation which we provide for the payment of employees.

Mr. STERLING. I think the Senator misunderstands my question. Would it not be a discrimination against the other employees who are allowed the bonus?

Mr. SMOOT. I misunderstood the Senator's question. There is no doubt about the fact that it would be a discrimination; but that is what they want and that is the purpose of the effort.

Mr. President, I want the Senate to see whether these men—
Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this is a very unimportant matter; it only involves \$50,000,000; still I think we ought to have a little order while the Senator is presenting the matter to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, when Col. Ridley was before the committee of the House the question of the pay for engineers and assistant engineers was taken up. Let me call the attention of the Senate to what the Government pays one class of engineers employed by it and what is paid to similar employees at the navy yards, and see whether the employees at the navy yards are not favored, even with the wage which they are receiving to-day without the bonus. The assistant engineer in the Potomac Park group, for instance, with the bonus, receives \$1,840. The scale at the New York Navy Yard, with the bonus, is \$3,141. Is there any reason, because perchance certain men are working in the navy yards, that they should receive 50 per cent more pay than the same class of employees receive who are working in a different place and paid from a different appropriation?

I wish to be fair in this matter; I want to treat alike all those who are doing the same kind of work for the Government. A year ago was the first time that the navy-yard employees were granted the \$240 bonus. The reason for that action at that time was that they claimed that during the two years previous they had not received the wage that similar employees in private industries surrounding the navy yards were receiving for like work. So the committee put the bonus provision in to correct that claim, and now this is what we are getting for trying to make matters right with those employees.

The statement of the Secretary of the Navy before the House committee, in conjunction with the other testimony that was given in that hearing, showed conclusively that the wages received by the navy yard employees were higher than the wages received by similar employees in any other department of the Government. It was for that reason that the House committee eliminated the bonus so far as those employees were concerned. I quote from his testimony as follows:

The labor wage adjustment board appointed to consider the question of a readjustment in the wages for employees under the Naval Establishment finds that the existing wage scale for the Naval Establishment is higher, the \$240 per annum congressional bonus considered, than the wage scale of any other industry as a whole in the United States of which it has information. The present wage scale of the shipbuilding industry is lower than that of the railroad industry. The difference between the navy yard scale and the shipbuilding industry is practically the congressional bonus of \$240 per annum.

Mr. Josephus Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy, did not ask to come before the committee in connection with this matter; he knows little about the details of the question; but Mr. Woodbury is the man who appeared before the committee, and he says the \$240 bonus that has been given to those employees this year makes their wages just that much higher than the scale of wages to which they are entitled.

So, Mr. President, if we allow the bonus to go out, they will be put upon the same basis as other employees of the Government, or nearly so, although the same class of employees would then be receiving less in some of the other departments. But suppose we admit that they have received wages greater in the past than these other men in the other departments, we certainly do not want to make that difference any wider than it is to-day.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senate will stand by the committee on this matter, and vote against the suspension of the rules.

Mr. UNDERWOOD obtained the floor.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. There are a good many Senators, I think, who desire to stand by the committee as to the particular matter the Senator has discussed, but who fear that if the rule is not set aside the entire bonus will be destroyed. Now, I should like to ask the Senator, if the rule is not suspended, would the original amendment as introduced by the Senate committee be in order? That is, could it be adopted as an amendment offered by some Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. Why, certainly; after the bill gets into the Senate it can be offered.

Mr. KENYON. That is the point.

Mr. SMOOT. The same objection, that it is legislation, could be made, of course, by any one Senator. There is not any doubt about that. But, Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that there is not any member of the Appropriations Committee but that believes that this bonus ought to be allowed on the salaries named in its amendment for another year. I have not any doubt but that if this amendment goes out here the House will put it on another appropriation bill; at least, I am quite sure the Senate committee will do so, and see that it goes through.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator is satisfied that the point of order would not be made to an amendment substantially such as the Senate committee has proposed?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think a point of order would be made. I know it would not be made by any member of the committee, and I can not see why there should be any objection on the part of any Senator who desires this legislation.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator is through, I desire recognition. Is the Senator through?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not know why the Senator from Utah and those opposed to this bonus should take such a roundabout way to try to persuade the Senate that a future opportunity may be given to pay the clerks of the National Government the \$240 bonus that they have been getting from the beginning. I want to say this to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], in answer to the question he asked the Senator from Utah: The Senator from Utah says that if this motion is voted down you can propose the bonus by amendment when this bill goes to the Senate. Well, suppose you do. If you can propose the original bonus, then the Senator from Massachusetts can propose his amendment, and the Senate must pass on it. Is not that so?

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. To be sure. Now, the Senator says you can put it on another bill. If you put it on another bill, the Senator from Massachusetts can propose his amendment to another bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but if the House of Representatives passes it, then the balance of it would not be subject to a point of order. If the House passes the bill with this provision in it, and it comes to the Senate, the only question then involved would be as to the matter that would be offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. To be sure; but it would not be subject to a point of order. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts is not subject to a point of order. It is a legitimate amendment, germane to a proposition pending before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator misunderstood me. I said the whole matter then would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly; and the whole matter can not be subject to a point of order if the motion made by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is agreed to to-day, and the rules are suspended, and the Senate is given an opportunity to vote on the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, of course not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So, why should we camouflage the thing?

Mr. SMOOT. I certainly have not tried to camouflage it in any way, and I do not think the Senator has any right to say that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not reflecting on the Senator from Utah, but I think his speech is camouflage. I say that in an entirely respectful sense, but I think it is camouflage. The issue before the Senate to-day is whether the United States Senate can attend to its business or whether it can be held up by the throat by one or two Members and prevented from carrying out the will of the Senate. That is all there is to it.

I have no objection to a Senator making a point of order about matters that are in a bill if they are improperly there; but can it be possible, when a great committee brings a provision before the Senate for consideration, simply because it can not have its way and dictate to the Senate on what terms an amendment subject to a point of order shall be received by the Senate, that the Senate can not legislate unless it accepts the terms of dictation by one or two men?

I want to say that so long as I remain a Senator of the United States I do not propose to do business upon that basis. If a committee brings before the Senate a proposition that is subject to a point of order, because it believes that for the good of the country, for proper and legitimate legislation, it should be before the Senate and be considered, then I say it does not lie in the committee's mouth to attempt to dictate to the Senate on what terms it shall accept its amendment. The Senate of the United States is still an independent body.

Ten years ago I saw this effort of a few men to enforce gag rule made in the House of Representatives until they carried their party to defeat; and if the opening hour of a new Republican administration is to institute a system of government in the Senate under which we are to expect that a few men can dictate to the Senate how it shall conduct its business, I say the life of the Republican Party will not last long. The American people never have stood and never will stand for such parliamentary procedure, and that is all that is involved in this case.

I voted with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] on his amendment to the bonus bill simply because I thought

he was right; but that is not the issue involved. If the Senator had been defeated, that would have been the end of it; but that is not the problem. Nobody suggested in the Senate on Saturday that this bonus proposition should be thrown out on a point of order until the Senate, by a decisive vote, decided that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts should go in the bill.

Now, whether that was right or wrong is not the question here; but when the time came the Senator from Massachusetts was confronted with this proposition, "You desert your constituency, you desert the cause you have advocated, you yield to the dictation of a few men—not the Senate—and let your constituency say that you have deserted their cause, or we will punish you by attempting to put the responsibility for the defeat of the entire bonus measure at your door." That can not be done as long as I can say anything to prevent it.

That is the issue before the Senate. It is not right; it is not fair; and it is not just that a Senator should be held up, absolutely held up, in this way. If the Senators in this Chamber thought the bonus proposition was bad in its initial stages, was improper on this bill, I take it that they would have the manhood and the courage to voice their objections before the amendment was offered; but when a Senator, after an amendment goes on the bill by the votes of a majority of his colleagues, then seeks to exercise his power of raising a point of order because he does not agree with the majority of the Senate, it is mere legislative sniping. That is all it is. It is not legislation. It is not the proper way to handle the business of the Senate. It is taking advantage of the situation, and trying to put a Member of the Senate in a position where he can not justify himself before his constituents.

That is the real issue here. That is the reason why I say that this motion to suspend the rules should be agreed to. The Senate should have an opportunity to express its will, now that the committee has brought in this amendment, and should have it now, when the bill is before the Senate. Then, of course, if the rules are suspended and the original committee amendment is offered, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will have an opportunity to offer his amendment to the bill. Of course, then the argument that the Senator from Utah makes will be perfectly legitimate, as to whether or not the Senate thinks it proper to put in the bill the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts; but I say that is not the issue now. More than that, it may be somewhat a doubtful proposition, because it has not been determined, but I do not believe the Chair was right on Saturday in ruling this amendment out on a point of order—not that the parliamentary rules do not deny the right to add general legislation to an appropriation bill, but once in the history of this body Senator Hear, then the presiding officer, held that it was too late after an amendment was offered to raise the point of order; and I say that after the Senate had voted on the question, and by an affirmative vote on a pending amendment to the main provision had decided in its favor, the Senate in that way approving of the amendment, it was too late for one Senator to strike it out on a point of order.

That, however, is neither here nor there. The real issue is not whether or not the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] shall be adopted, but whether or not the Senate is going to submit to the proposition that the entire bonus given to Government employees shall go out of this bill because one Member wants it out, when the Senate by a vote can legitimately suspend the rules and put it in? Because one Member proposes an amendment here that some Senators think was wrong, even if others think it was right, because it is possible that that amendment may be adopted to the original proposition, it is not right to say that that is a cause for Senators to vote against making in order the bonus that is necessary to take care of these clerks by reason of the increased cost of living during the war.

I believe in economy. I believe in all the economy we can bring to the Government. I was on the committee when it granted the original bonus. I joined in that action because I knew those employees of the Government were suffering by reason of the increased cost of living and their low wages, which were fixed long before the war was inaugurated. I know that condition has not changed now as to most of them, and I think the Senate should suspend the rule and put this provision in the bill, where it belongs. Then, when it goes in the bill, I do not think any Senator has the right to say that he will not accept the will of the majority of the Senate as to the provision staying in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, there is no doubt but that the motion of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE] to suspend the rule will be carried. That is a foregone conclusion, notwithstanding that the issue seems to have been changed from what it was declared to be on the eve of our adjournment

on Saturday. The senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] then stated that the issue was that one man's objection would "send an empty dinner pail to the families of the Government employees."

I have had occasion, Mr. President, during my service in the Senate, to protest against one-man power, or that of two or three men, to hold up the business of the Senate. I had something to do with the enactment of that amendment to our rules which provides for a modified cloture. But I have never heard any denunciation of the power of one man to hold up the Senate unless his hold-up was designed to defeat an appropriation. Since I have been here a number of very large appropriations have been added to appropriation bills by the exercise of this power to obstruct the business of the Senate until his will was acceded to.

The first instance of this sort after I took my seat here occurred in February, 1913. The occasion was the consideration of the omnibus public buildings bill. About 9 o'clock one evening the then senior Senator from Missouri, Mr. Stone, entered the Chamber and took his seat at his desk, being next to the one I now occupy. He brought with him a package of papers about half a foot in thickness, and consisting principally of typewritten matter. He then offered an amendment to the bill, providing for the appropriation of forty-five or fifty thousand dollars for improvements needed in the public building at St. Louis. It went out promptly on a point of order, and then the Senator, who was nothing if not deliberate, announced to the Senate that he felt it his duty to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the very important reasons underlying his amendment. He then began to read, in a slow, monotonous voice, and consumed about an hour of the valuable time of the Senate, when the chairman of the committee having charge of the bill, in order to secure its passage, was forced to accept the amendment and allow the appropriation.

That is one instance of scores of others which have disfigured our consideration of appropriation bills ever since I have been here. But I do not recall a single instance in which a Senator exercising that authority was rebuked or even censured for his efforts to thus secure money from the Treasury.

Here we are confronted, Mr. President, with an exactly opposite condition. A point of order is made to an amendment which, if enacted, would add from forty-five to fifty million dollars to our annual expenditure, and because, forsooth, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] had the courage—and it takes courage in this body to oppose an appropriation—because he had the courage, in view of the attempted extension of this amendment so as to carry additional millions, to make a point of order against the amendment, he was at once assailed by the leaders on both sides of this Chamber, one directly and the other indirectly, for having the audacity to stand between the Treasury of the United States and \$50,000,000.

The Senator from Kansas has told the Senate that he was opposed to it ab initio and had agreed to keep silent only upon the assumption that the amendment would not be further extended. At the risk of becoming equally unpopular I assert that the people of the United States, if they are at all appreciative of any effort toward economy in this extravagant body, should commend the Senator, although the Senate will undoubtedly condemn him.

Mr. President, the proceedings of last Saturday evening were most extraordinary; they were unique. The minority leader, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], in a short comment upon the conduct of the Senator from Kansas, not only expressed his disapprobation of that Senator's conduct, but announced that this bill shall not pass if he can prevent it so long as the point of order is insisted upon and this amendment is excluded from a vote. Here is a threatened exercise of one-man power quite as condemnatory, in my judgment, as that which the Senator criticizes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope the Senator will quote me correctly when he attempts to quote me at all.

Mr. THOMAS. I certainly shall not intentionally misquote the Senator.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What I said was that I would resist the final passage of the bill until a vote had been obtained on the question as to whether the Senate would suspend the rule or not.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me read what the Senator said.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is what I said.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator said:

For one I wish to give notice that this bill will not pass, if I can help it, until the Senate has had a fair and just opportunity to vote on the merits of this proposition, and I wish to give notice now that I shall move to suspend the rules and adopt the amendment as the committee has reported it, and then the Senator from Massachusetts

[Mr. WALSH] will have an opportunity to propose his amendment if the rules are suspended. I have not the form here, but the clerk has it at the desk.

I think the words of the Senator justify my criticism.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. All I wish to call to the Senator's attention is the fact that I was referring to a motion to suspend the rule, and I stand on that proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator closed his remarks by saying that he had not the form of such a notice, but that it would be presented, and thereupon the leader of the majority in this body, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who had in the meantime prepared that identical notice, took the floor and made the motion, both sides competing for the credit of suspending the rule of the Senate that this extraordinary appropriation might be made.

Why is this? Is it because of an overweening and earnest desire to accomplish a great philanthropic purpose by increasing the compensation of the Government employees, to the end that they may not suffer, or is it a competition between the two sides of this Chamber for their organized vote? I do not know. It is in line with our pension legislation and with all legislation designed to reward somebody or some organization at the expense of the Federal Treasury. I can not but regard it as a competitive piece of politics.

The Senator from Alabama said:

And now, forsooth, because the Committee on Appropriations can not lay down the law in the Senate, crossing every "i" and dotting every "i" as to how the bonus shall become a law, we must drive it all out of the bill and let one man's objection send an empty dinner pail to the families of the Government employees.

I do not think the Senator from Alabama really meant that. That is what he denounced as camouflage a few moments ago, because he knows that it is not the fact.

Why, Mr. President, if it were true that this committee wanted to "send an empty dinner pail to the families" of the employees for the next fiscal year, how do we account for the fact that to-day clamoring multitudes in the city of Washington and throughout the country are anxious to take these places, every aspirant feeling his responsibility for the election of Senator Harding, and insisting upon that reward which ought to come to every politician who performs his duty to his party, and therefore to his country? Do these time servers of the dominant party fear that their selection will confront them with empty dinner pails and starvation?

Mr. President, the class sought to be directly covered into this bonus by the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], according to the statement made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], whether they get this bonus or not, whether the board increases their emolument or not, are enjoying a compensation of \$2,160 a year. That is immensely more than the average compensation of working people in the country, who must live on what they earn. Will any man, well informed upon the subject or who has given it any study, assert that unless we add \$240 to that sum we will send an empty dinner pail to the families of the Government employees?

The Postmaster General said some time ago that the employees of the Post Office Department are the best paid class of employees in the United States. Nobody as yet, so far as my observation goes, has denied that proposition. Except for the police department of this city, I am prepared to contend, Mr. President, that there is practically no need of this bonus, provided the employees of the Government are willing to work and to live as do other employees throughout the country who have not access to the Treasury of the United States.

I think it is fair to add to that statement that a very large proportion of them do not earn the money which they receive now. The other day in the Interior Department I had occasion to ask a gentleman whose attire did not indicate the presence of empty dinner pails, occupying a desk and reading some work of interest, if he could tell me the floor on which was the Commissioner of the Land Office. He hesitated, stopped, turned to some memoranda, and began to look them over carefully. I said, "Can you tell me?" He said, "I will tell you in a second." I said, "Good day." There is a man who, I have no doubt, needs the \$240 bonus and who is supposed to earn it by dispensing information for the public. I found the Commissioner of the Land Office without the aid of anyone.

A short time ago I had occasion to call upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, whose office is just across the street from the new building that is devoted, I think, to the estate-tax division of that bureau. I was seated where I could observe that building across the street. On one floor every window was filled with beautiful girls, very attractively and appropriately dressed. From the motion of their lips I think they were all busily engaged in chewing gum. Their attention was attracted to some

spectacle in the street. I sat there for 20 minutes by the watch, during which the audience was apparently engrossed in the spectacle upon the street, their beautiful jaws moving in rhythmic unison, save as their charming and delightful conversation with each other interrupted. No doubt those ladies need this bonus, and any Senator who has the audacity to stand between them and it is no gentleman.

Mr. President, the moving forces behind the amendment and the amendment to the amendment are the powerful organizations of Federal employees, whose officers, selected from themselves, instead of attending to their duties, haunt the lobbies of the Congress and by threat, by persuasion, and by entreaty dissipate the objections to their demands and wring from the eloquent lips of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alabama, the statement that unless the amendment passes we shall "send them home to their families with empty dinner pails for the next fiscal year."

Some time ago I said we no longer had any watchdogs of the Treasury. I was mistaken. We have more watchdogs of the Treasury than we have ever had before, but they are watching for an opportunity to break into it, and if the opportunity does not present itself they make it. The siege of Balaklava was not a circumstance compared to the perennial siege of the Federal Treasury. Everyone who thirsteth is there with his own watchdog, many of them in the two Houses, watching for an opportunity to increase their compensation, secure added appropriations, swell expenditures, and thereby increase the burdens of taxation.

Now, when will this bonus practice end? It will never end, mark my words, until the amount of the bonus is crystallized into the salary appropriations and becomes a permanent and irreducible part of it. Does any man expect, in view of present conditions, that the high cost of living for the fiscal year 1922 will be anything like the high cost of living in 1920? We know that it will not. We know that prices are descending now and will continue to descend. We are on the down grade. Notwithstanding that, a contingency said to have existed in 1916 is still made a contingency to the end that \$50,000,000 in excess of our salary rolls shall be divided among employees. It will be done. There is no question about that. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] for the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] will be agreed to. There is no question about that. I am not prepared to say that it should or should not be. I confess that I do not yet know what the effect of it will be beyond the fact that the mover of the amendment asserts that it will include a very large number of employees of the Government who would otherwise be excluded from it, while the committee declares that it will not. This presents another feature of national legislation to which I wish merely to refer.

When an emergency arises making it necessary to temporarily increase the compensation of a few of our employees we must, in order to meet it, make that increase general, to apply to the thousands and hundreds of thousands of Government employees throughout the country. The Senate will give the bonus, as I have stated, for reasons that I do not care to take up the time of the Senate to discuss now, to the Metropolitan police of this city, but in order to give them a needed stipend it is compelled to extend it to every employee, and if there is an even seeming exception to the general rule, then that exception must be eliminated, and woe unto the Senator who has the audacity to oppose it. He is not only unpatriotic but he is exerting his one-man power to hold up the legislation of the Senate. His name should be anathema. "Woe unto ye, scribes and pharisees," says the Good Book. Woe unto ye, all Senators who would seek to minimize the outflow of Uncle Sam's money. You are denounced outside, of course. But now it is become the fashion to denounce Members of the Congress and to exorcise them because, forsooth, they exercise their undoubted right to make a point of order against legislation which is clearly obnoxious to the Senate rules.

During the last session I had occasion to say that the rules of the Senate were whatever the majority at the particular time wanted them to be.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, the point of order was sustained.

Mr. THOMAS. I know it was.

Mr. LODGE. And sustained by the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. I know it was.

Mr. LODGE. The motion which I make to suspend the rule is properly recognized, and provided for in the rules.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. I have not gone outside of the rules at all.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true. The Senator has not gone outside of the rules. He seldom does. But he "beat the Senator

from Alabama" to it in preparing and presenting a notice of a motion to suspend the rule for the purpose of eliminating the consequences of the point of order.

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely, but I maintain that our rules provide for the suspension in precisely that way.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true; yet the Senator knows that the Presiding Officer of the Senate has been overruled scores of times during the last eight years simply because his ruling was obnoxious to the view of the majority of the Senate, and in most instances in my judgment the Chair was clearly right. The Senator from Massachusetts is perhaps more familiar with the rules of the Senate than any of its Members. He observes them as carefully and conscientiously as any man in this body. He has adorned the Senate for many years and I trust that he has not yet reached the meridian of his usefulness. There is no question but that he observes the rules. Yet I must say that his is a master hand at applying the rules so as to accomplish such purposes as this.

I think, however, that the odds are even between the two parties on the proposition. They are now neck and neck in their rush toward the relief of the poor employee who is threatened with empty dinner pails unless he can secure this amendment. I have no doubt that the beneficiaries as usual will be entirely impartial in recognizing their obligations to both parties and pay but little attention to either, until another demand ripens and another need for invading the lobbies of the Senate shall present itself.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I intended upon the subject. Let me say in conclusion that I regard this as the commencement of that coming era of economy and frugality in public expenses which both parties so liberally promised to the people of the United States last fall and upon which, among other issues, the Republican Party won. In the course of the next few years, assuming that the precedent will be followed, it will result in squandering all the money that can be wrung from the people by taxation. When these shall have been gathered and distributed to the beneficiaries of the Government, public affairs must run thereafter by levies on capital and taking over the assets and investments of the property-owning public. Great is popular government in Washington. The winning platform of Tittlebat Titmouse was everything for everybody. This has become a standing principle of congressional action, cheerfully recognized and constantly applied by both parties.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is not my intention to detain the Senate more than a moment. I stated my position on the question quite fully last Saturday. There is no need to repeat it now.

The Senator from Kansas exercised his right under the rules of the Senate. If the Senate is not satisfied with the rules as they are laid down they should change them. The rules provide that a Senator may make a point of order at any time. I made that point of order when I thought the proper time came. The rules also provide that if that point of order is made and sustained any Senator may move to suspend the rules. That has been done in this case, and it is up to the Senate to say whether or not it will suspend the rules to make the amendment in order, which, if done, will make the amendment in order as offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER]. This amendment, if made, will carry \$17,491,096.85.

I am sorry that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is not here at the moment. He referred to my conduct and criticized it somewhat and said that the Senator who made the point would not go before his constituents on the question. I wish to say that I would be very glad to have the RECORD of last Saturday read to every audience in the State of Kansas. If I voted the other way I should dislike to have it read in my State. But the people in the country will stand by the Senators who are trying to save money for them, the taxpayers. Instead of "sniping," as the Senator from Alabama accused me of doing, I carried out my right in the open under the rules of the Senate, and I did not play politics. Senators who vote for the proposition know that they are doing it for no other reason on earth than politics, and with no regard for the appropriations or for the taxpayers of the country.

The report upon this one question is very plain. It is as follows:

The labor wage adjustment board, appointed to consider the question of readjustment of wages for employees under the Naval Establishment, find that the existing wage scale for the Navy Department is higher, the \$240 per annum congressional bonus considered, than the wage scale of any other industry as a whole in the United States of which it has information.

I am advised from the reports that the number covered by the amendment is 72,879 and that the bonus to them would amount to \$17,491,096.85.

This is what Senators are trying to force upon the people: They claim they are standing by the men and women who are

working in the departments, when, as a matter of fact, they are voting against them, because they propose to give to the navy yard employees a double bonus and they would limit the other employees of the Government to a single bonus. That is the simple question involved. If the Senator from Alabama wishes to be fair to the other Government employees, let him move to make their bonus \$480, as he is doing for the men who are employed in the navy yards of the country.

I am heartily sick and tired of some of the speeches that are being made upon the floor of the Senate in regard to the underpay of employees. Some of the lower-paid men and women do get too small salaries; their salaries should be increased and I stand ready to vote to give them an increase, but the Senator from Alabama knows, as I know and as every Senator knows, that there are thousands of employees upon the Government's pay roll who could not go home and obtain one-half the pay they are receiving from the Government.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I understood the Senator from Kansas to say that if the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] shall be adopted, it will be tantamount to granting a bonus of \$480 a year to the navy yard employees?

Mr. CURTIS. It is equivalent to giving that class of employees a bonus of \$480 a year, because it gives them a bonus after their salaries have been increased by a board.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Exactly. Now, is it not a fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York proposes to make the law for the coming year the same as for last year, and that if it is equivalent to \$480 this year the Senator's committee, the Senate, and the other House of Congress gave those employees \$480 last year?

Mr. CURTIS. Since the appropriation of last year the Labor Board has allowed an increase of their wages, and the Senator from Massachusetts knows it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But they increased their wage—

Mr. CURTIS. And they considered the \$240 bonus, and the Senator from Massachusetts knows that.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. They increased the wage under the law which compelled them to take into consideration—

Mr. CURTIS. There is no use trying to camouflage the question.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator permit me to complete my statement?

Mr. CURTIS. I will.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is true that the wage board increased the wages of these men, but not until they took into consideration what the law compelled them to take into consideration, that they were receiving the \$240 bonus.

Mr. CURTIS. And the wage board found that the increase made up for the \$240 bonus that the Government was paying them and that their compensation was equal to and more than that paid to employees performing similar work in private industries of the same class.

The truth is that men have left private employment where they were getting four dollars and a half a day and have gone to the navy yards and received on an average \$9 a day. On the other hand, there was a case a short time ago, where a man working for the Government for a salary of \$2,400 per annum left the Government employ in order to make more; he went to Chicago and secured employment with a firm there, but they reduced his salary to \$1,200 a year, because he was not worth any more. Case after case of that kind might be cited. There are men and women working for the Government who are not receiving what they should receive. Let us, therefore, do what we should do; let us take up the reclassification bill; and if we can not do that, let us in connection with the appropriation bills fix the salaries of the men and women who are working for the Government at a rate to which they are entitled, and then stand by it like men, and not vote a certain way because we want the political influence of some organization or another.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Kansas why what he suggests has not been done? More than two years ago I myself made a motion in the Committee on Appropriations to provide for a commission to reclassify Government employees. The commission was appointed; and it reported to Congress a year ago. Now the Senator says that report should be acted upon. Why has it not been done?

Mr. CURTIS. I understand it has not been done for two reasons: First, the delay in submitting the report; and, second, the dissatisfaction of certain labor lobbyists.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But that would not stop the Senator from Kansas from acting?

Mr. CURTIS. No; it would not stop the Senator from Kansas from acting; but the Senator from Kansas is not on the committee considering reclassification, and the Senator from Alabama knows that the Senator from Kansas is not on that committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not recall the membership of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Kansas is not on the reclassification committee; he is not on the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which considered the pending bill; and is not on any of the subcommittees which have to do with the fixing of salaries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have served on the Committee on Appropriations, though I am not now a member of it; and I say the fact that there might be labor lobbyists in Washington who object to the legislation, I know would not stop the legitimate action of the Senator from Kansas or any of his colleagues in connection with reclassification legislation. That is what I mean in reply to the suggestion of the Senator that the proposed legislation was stopped, although it has been pending here a year, because of the activities of labor lobbyists. I have a greater respect for the members of the Senator's committee than he has, for I know those men, and I am sure when the Senator from Kansas reflects on what he has said he will not charge that his colleagues on the committee have refused to act upon the report for that reason.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Kansas has not charged that the report has not been made so that the committee could act upon it, but the submission of the report was delayed, as the Senator knows, month by month, and the time for presenting the report was extended from time to time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that the report, as he knows, has been before the Senate, if he will recall the matter, for about a year. The report came in about a year ago.

Mr. CURTIS. It was made about a year ago. The Senate adjourned in June and did not meet until December.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator's committee had the entire summer. I am not reflecting on the committee, and I did not do so in my speech; I know it is a hard driven committee; but what I have contended is that when the committee of which the Senator from Kansas is a member has not carried out, although it was authorized to do so, exactly what he has contended for, it does not lie in the mouth of the committee to say that they will not pay this bonus until they carry out what Congress has authorized them to do, and that is to readjust the wage scale.

There is no difference between the Senator and me about a readjustment of the wage scale. I believe in it; I myself, as I stated awhile ago, offered the amendment in the committee which was subsequently attached to the appropriation bill, authorizing a commission to be appointed to readjust the wage scale.

Mr. CURTIS. But the Senator from Alabama voted to extend the time in which they should make their report, thereby delaying action.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly, because they said they were not ready to report.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. The joint commission on reclassification filed its report in the Senate on the 12th day of March, 1920.

Mr. CURTIS. A year ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. A year ago. At that time it was requested that the report be referred to the Appropriations Committee; and from that time on until the adjournment of Congress in June I repeatedly called the attention of the Senate to the report, because as bills were coming up from time to time dealing with the salaries of Federal employees in the District of Columbia and action was being taken unscientifically by piecemeal. I realize that if the report had been taken up and considered this whole matter could have been readjusted and settled.

Mr. CURTIS. It has not been done, and the question before us, I want to say to Senators, is this: The Senator from Kansas has proceeded according to the rules of the Senate; the Senator from Kansas has no apology to make; the Senator from Kansas is ready to go before his constituency at any time on this question. The Senator from Kansas also would like the pleasure of going into some of the States of the Senators who are trying to force this increased tax upon the people and

seeing the result after he had read to them the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Reclassification Board has been referred to. Let me call the attention of the Senate to what that report, if put into operation to-day, would mean to the employees in navy yards. To-day in the navy yards an assistant superintendent is paid \$4,800; under the reclassification report, if adopted, he would receive \$3,000; a chief clerk in the navy yard is paid \$2,736 to-day, whereas under the reclassification report he would be paid \$2,500; a clerk of class 4 at the navy yard is paid to-day \$2,304; under the proposed reclassification he would receive \$2,400; a clerk of class 3 in the navy yards is paid \$2,184; under the reclassification report he would be paid \$1,980. The messengers in all other departments of the Government are paid \$900, whereas in the navy yards they are paid \$1,248, and the reclassification report provides that they shall be paid \$1,080. A chief engineer in navy yards is paid to-day \$4,800; under the reclassification report he would receive \$3,000; the assistant engineers in navy yards are to-day paid \$3,144, while under the reclassification report they would be paid \$2,400.

There is no other part of the Government service where the employees are paid wages as high as are paid in the navy yards to-day.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator tell me from what page of the reclassification report he was reading?

Mr. SMOOT. Page 857; and if the Senator will look at it he will see there exactly the whole schedule presented to the committee by Col. Ridley.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does that deal with all mechanics and machinists?

Mr. SMOOT. It deals with every employee. I might go on down the list and show the figures in connection with carpenters and painters. For instance, to-day a foreman of carpenters in the navy yard is receiving \$2,740, while under the reclassification report he would receive \$2,050. I may say that in all of the other departments the foreman of carpenters is being paid \$1,800, so that those employees are being paid at least 50 per cent more in the navy yards than in other places under the Government. What character of employees are they that they should receive this compensation and, forsooth, ask the Senate of the United States to suspend its rules in order that there may be added to the amounts they are now receiving \$240 per annum more?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this is not the time to discuss the merits of the amendment providing that employees of navy yards and arsenals shall receive a bonus; but I can not help, in reply to what the Senator from Utah has said, referring to other inequalities in pay. In connection with the great public buildings of the country we find engineers, laborers, and mechanics charged with the responsibility of keeping those buildings in repair, receiving in many cases 50 per cent less than similar employees in other branches of the Government service. That is an injustice which ought to be rectified, and at once.

The question now before the Senate, however, Mr. President, to be determined by the vote we shall take in a moment, is whether or not there shall be paid any bonus at all to any Government employees. Let us settle that question. If Senators are in favor of a bonus they should vote "yea" on this proposition; if they are against the payment of a bonus of any kind to any employees, they should vote "nay." After we settle that, we may determine in an orderly way whether or not the employees of the navy yards and arsenals shall receive the bonus provided for in the amendment which was under consideration on Saturday last.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] has stated the proposition as it now stands. It is not one class of employees only that is involved in this proposition, it is all of them. As the matter now stands, nobody will get the bonus. The Senate is called upon this morning to say whether or not it will continue this bonus to these people for another year.

Mr. President, we read in the papers nearly every day that the manufacturer has reduced his price, that the wholesale merchant has reduced his price, but that the retail merchants are holding up their prices; and they are the people from whom these employees have to buy. I submit that this is in the aftermath of the war. Conditions are not yet normal. These people need this pay, and this Government ought to be big enough and good enough, and I am sure it will be, to grant this bonus to them.

I recall when this country became involved in war with a foreign country that a vast army of young men and young women came to this city to aid the Government in time of war. Many of them left lucrative positions at home in order

that they might have a part in winning this Great War. They wanted to be able to say, "I contributed to the winning of the war." The Government needed them, and needs them now, and they are rendering efficient service to our Government. Our boys, 4,000,000 of them, were called to the colors; 2,000,000 and more went abroad. All of them are back home now except those who sleep in France, "where the poppies blow." They have business with the Government. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Pension Bureau, and other departments have a vast amount of business on account of this great army of men scattered throughout the country. Would Senators cut off this bonus and deprive these men and women who are working for the Government of a sufficient amount of compensation to enable them to live decently and worthily in the Capital of the Nation?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can answer the Senator very frankly, and say to him that if the Senator does not want to offer the amendment when the bill gets into the Senate I shall offer it myself, to take care of all of the employees with the exception of the employees in the navy yards, who are drawing to-day 50 per cent larger salaries than persons performing the same class of work are drawing in the other departments of our Government.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am in favor of fair treatment for all these employees, and I submit to the Senator from Utah that this commission on adjusting the wage scale has the authority now, if it finds that anybody is getting two bonuses, to cut one of them off. If that is true, no harm can come from this provision.

Aside from this question, Mr. President, I submit to the Senate and to the country that the performance I witnessed in this body on Saturday was the most ridiculous ever witnessed in any parliamentary body, according to my judgment. The idea of the United States Senate having a rule that will permit a measure to go to vote, and permit a majority to vote in favor of it, and then lodge it in the power of any one Senator to rise up, after the judgment of the Senate is recorded and say, "I make the point of order against it"! Why, Mr. President, it can not be defended. The rule ought to be repealed. The idea of the Senate of the United States sitting quietly by and permitting a measure to go to a vote, and obtaining an expression from this body, and then one Senator rising up and saying, in effect, "Inasmuch as the Senate has not voted as I wanted it to vote, I will therefore exercise my veto power," and defeat the expressed desire of four-fifths of the Senate!

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator ought to be fair. There had been no vote upon the provision against which I raised the point of order.

Mr. HEFLIN. We had just voted upon a part of the proposition.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senate had voted upon an amendment to the amendment. The point of order was made against the entire amendment, and not against the amendment to the amendment that had been voted upon.

Mr. HEFLIN. It does not change the principle. We were perfecting the amendment and we were voting on it, leading up to the time we would vote on the whole amendment, and one Senator rises at that stage of the game and makes the point of order.

Mr. President, the Senate ought to change that rule. It ought not to permit any Senator to wait and make a point of order after a vote is had. That is the point I am making. If any Senator wants to make a point of order against any amendment, I would not deprive him of that privilege; but let him make it in time, before a vote is had. The idea of permitting a Senator to make a point of order at any time, to my mind, is ridiculous.

I am in favor of suspending the rule and putting this bonus amendment on the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that when important matters are pending before this or the other body, we should have the right to suspend the rules; and I am sure the Senator from Alabama will remember that I was one of those who joined him in the House in voting to overthrow the autocracy, to overthrow the power held by the majority of the House at that time; but the principle involved at that time was a fundamental one.

I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. I am also a member of the subcommittee having this matter in charge. Those of you who say that the question now is whether or not there shall be any bonus I believe will agree, upon reflection, that that is not the case. I am sure the Members of the Senate who are opposed to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York agree that there should be a bonus to all the em-

ployees of the Government except to the lump-sum employees, including those in the navy yards. Now, it seems to me to be unfair for those who are in favor of this amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts to say, "Unless the navy employees get a double bonus"—because that is exactly what it is—"none of the employees shall have a bonus."

We are not objecting to a bonus to any of the Government employees except to these particular employees; and, Mr. President, there is merit in that objection. After the committee considered all of these salaries we found that the employees in the navy yard are being paid a higher wage than any other employees. If you want to be fair, increase the bonus to \$480 for all Government clerks. If you are not willing to do that, you are not fair to all of them. If you only want to give a double bonus to those who work in the navy yards, you are simply extending the benefit to a very few.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just there?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does not the Senator agree to the suggestion I make, that the commission on adjusting the wage scale can strike off part of that if a particular class are getting two bonuses?

Mr. GRONNA. No; I wholly disagree with the Senator. The commission could not strike off the bonus, because that is a legislative act. The bonus would have to be paid if we vote it in. There is not any doubt about that.

Mr. President, there is not a member of the committee who will not agree that the Government clerks, except these few employees in the navy yards, should be paid a bonus this year.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from North Dakota, I believe, is a member of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. Is the Senator quite certain of his statement that these navy yard employees were allowed this \$240 when the wage scale was fixed by the wage board?

Mr. GRONNA. The wage was fixed by the board after the bonus was allowed. I forget the date, but it was some time last fall, I believe. Perhaps the chairman of the committee can inform us as to that.

Mr. CALDER. It was in November.

Mr. GRONNA. There was an increase by the wage board, I think, of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents an hour, from 5 to $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents an hour; but I do know that the employees in the navy yard without the \$240 bonus are receiving a higher salary than the employees in the other departments.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, this was one of the questions which was in dispute on Saturday, the different Senators seeming to take different views of the question. If these men have already in fact, though not in name, received the bonus, certainly they ought not to receive it a second time.

Mr. GRONNA. I state that it is a fact that they are receiving a higher salary without the \$240 bonus than the employees in the other departments with the \$240 bonus.

I wish it were possible for us to grant the request of all Government employees and pay them a liberal wage. I would be the last one to refuse not only a fair but a liberal salary to all in the employ of the United States Government; but we must take conditions as they are, and if we do that you will find that in some of the departments many thousands of men and women are to-day working for a low wage—from \$1,000 to \$1,200 per year. Those people ought to be first taken care of; all these low-salaried employees are entitled to the first consideration; but it is hardly fair to say that the employees in one department, who are now receiving a higher wage than the employees in any other department, shall have a double bonus; and I do not like the term "bonus." What ought to be done in every case is for the Congress to appoint some committee or some commission, make a thorough investigation of this whole matter, and then allow a living wage to all the men and women employed by the Government.

By the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts you increase this bill more than \$17,000,000, and it all goes to a class which is being paid a higher wage than the employees in any other department.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal about the departments losing some of these men. If you go out through the rural sections of the country and see the conditions, I want to say to you that you will find that there are thousands of men and women just as well qualified to take these positions as those who are holding them who would be glad to get these positions.

If there were a fundamental principle involved in setting aside the rule, I should not hesitate in voting for it, but I can

not vote to set aside a rule for trivial causes. I believe we ought to study the merits of the case, and I agree with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] that this motion ought to be voted down at this time. I am quite sure that it will not be voted down, but as a member of the committee having had this matter under consideration I can not vote for it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] left with me, and I am afraid he left with the other Senators, the impression that the Joint Reclassification Commission reclassified the salaries of the employees in the navy yards. This is the language of the act under which that commission proceeded with its work:

It shall be the duty of the commission to investigate the rates of compensation paid to civilian employees by the municipal government and the various executive departments and other governmental establishments in the District of Columbia, except the navy yard and the Postal Service.

So the commission on which I had the honor to serve for a year did not reclassify the salaries paid to those in the navy yard.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know why the Senator thinks I have made any statement that there was a reclassification in the navy yards. I took particular pains to say that the navy yard pay and bonus amounted to a certain amount of money, and that for the same class of people in the other departments of our Government doing the same work the scale under the reclassification report showed the amount that they reported upon that class. The Senator from Utah knows that the Reclassification Commission did not have anything to do with the navy yard or the post office employees; and that is why, when the first bonus bill was passed, the navy yard and also the Post Office Department were exempted from the benefits of a bonus; and the navy yard was never in the bonus bill until last year, and the Appropriations Committee put it in last year because representatives of the men said that for two years preceding that time the wages of the mechanics in outside industries on account of the war had been increased more than once in a year, and had been increased more than the wages had been increased in the Government service. In order to take care of that, Senators, we gave them a \$240 bonus to take care of the difference that had occurred two years before, and this is what we are getting from these same representatives. They knew what it was given to them for.

Mr. HENDERSON. In order that a wrong impression may not be had, I simply wanted the Senate to know that the commission did not attempt to reclassify the salaries of any of the employees of the navy yards, and that such reclassification is not contained in the report. The Senator from Utah was not reading, a short time ago, from the report of the Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries, but from a hearing had in the House.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and I was reading a statement made by Col. Ridley, showing the scale of wages paid at the navy yards for all classes of employees—clerks and everyone else—and in comparison with those he shows the wages paid in the other departments for similar work under the reclassification report?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Utah a question before the vote is taken. I do not care to discuss the merits of the amendment offered by me for the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], but in view of his argument, and the arguments of other members of the Committee on Appropriations, I would like to read one line from the letter of the Secretary of the Navy of January 21, and ask the Senator whether that is a truthful statement or not of what would happen if this bonus should be denied these men? He said:

Should Congress fail to continue the bonus, the result will be an automatic decrease in the amount received by the men below the sum which I have already approved as being just and proper.

I think the Senate is entitled to an answer "Yes" or "No" as to whether that statement is true or not.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that is very easy to answer, and I will say that it is true, because the fact that those men have been drawing for the past year \$240 per year more than the wage board said they were entitled to—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Wait just a moment, and I will answer the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is that a fair answer?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it is a fair answer.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does it need explanation, other than "yes" or "no," whether that is a true statement or not?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have stated to the Senate a number of times the reason why the present \$240 bonus was

given, but the Senator from Massachusetts does not seem to pay any attention to it. The Committee on Appropriations never intended the bonus to go beyond the 30th of June of this year, and the bonus was put in the bill in order to take care of the condition which existed at that time with the employees of the navy yard.

We know, Mr. President, that the wages of outside labor increased very rapidly, more rapidly than it was possible for the board to increase the wages of these men. Therefore we thought, in order to make it up, to make them whole, we would give them \$240. The House did not put the bonus provision in the bill. It never was put in until the Senate put it in last year, and I have stated why it was put in the bill. I was a member of the subcommittee, and when the representatives of the employees appeared before the subcommittee and made their statement and showed the salaries that were being paid men outside of the Government service, we thought that these employees were entitled to consideration, and that we would give them a \$240 bonus, and all we are doing now is to take it away, because to-day they are receiving wages as high as or higher than those paid for the same work outside.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, may I ask the Chair, for my own information in voting on the question of the suspension of the rule, whether, under the notice given by the Senator from Massachusetts, if the rule should be suspended so as to make this amendment in order, it would make the proposed Walsh amendment in order also?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the opinion of the Chair, it undoubtedly would. The Senate having entered into general legislation and opened the door, it can pursue it as far as it pleases. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LOBAR]. Will the Senate suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI for the purpose of offering the amendment reported by the committee as section 6 of the bill?—which is well understood by the Senate. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. I have been unable to obtain a transfer and therefore I will withhold my vote.

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. In his absence, being unable to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have temporarily a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I am advised that I can transfer my pair to the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], and I do so, and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I do not know how he would vote if he were present. I have not been able to secure a transfer of my pair, and I therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. After conferring with his colleague, I believe I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair for the day with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I have voted. Therefore my vote will stand.

Mr. EDGE. Has the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. EDGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], which I transfer to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], and vote "yea."

Mr. FERNALD. I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. On this matter I understand he would vote as I am about to vote, and therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

The roll call resulted—yeas 60, nays, 12, as follows:

YEAS—60.

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Simmons
Ball	Gay	La Follette	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Gerry	Lenroot	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Gooding	Lodge	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Gore	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Capper	Harris	Nelson	Stanley
Colt	Harrison	New	Sutherland
Culberson	Heflin	Phelan	Swanson
Dial	Hitchcock	Pittman	Trammell
Dillingham	Johnson, Calif.	Pomerene	Underwood
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Jones, Wash.	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kellogg	Sheppard	Willis
France	Keyes	Shields	Wolcott

NAYS—12.

Curtis	McCumber	Poindexter	Thomas
Gronna	Overman	Smoot	Wadsworth
Kenyon	Phipps	Sterling	Warren

NOT VOTING—24.

Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary	Penrose
Cummins	Kendrick	Myers	Robinson
Elkins	King	Newberry	Sherman
Fall	Knox	Norris	Townsend
Glass	McCormick	Owen	Watson
Henderson	McLean	Page	Williams

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to suspend the rule the yeas are 60 and the nays are 12. So the rule is suspended for the purpose of offering the amendment. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to appeal to the chairman of the committee having charge of the unfinished business, to give us 15 or 20 minutes more to dispose of the legislative appropriation bill. I wish to say to him and to the Senate that unless we can move these bills faster, most, if not all, of the appropriation bills will fail, in my judgment.

Mr. McCUMBER. It was the program to take up the emergency tariff bill on Saturday morning. I yielded to the Senator in charge of the legislative appropriation bill, with the general understanding that he would get through with it early on Saturday. All of Saturday was taken up, and it is yet undisposed of. I dislike very much to interfere with an appropriation bill for which the House is waiting, if it can be disposed of in a few minutes, but I also feel that we can get a vote upon the unfinished business by to-morrow evening sometime, and therefore I am especially desirous that we should go ahead with the unfinished business. However, if the Senator from Wyoming feels that he can dispose of the legislative appropriation bill in 15 or 20 minutes, I do not think there would be any objection to proceeding with that bill. If that course is satisfactory, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of proceeding with the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee what the increase of the appropriation will be if the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] is agreed to?

Mr. WARREN. Approximately \$17,000,000, taking the word of the witnesses from the Navy Department.

Mr. THOMAS. Am I correct, therefore, in my assumption that the amendment will itself add something like \$40,000,000?

Mr. WARREN. The entire amount last year was \$51,000,000, about \$35,000,000 estimated, and \$16,000,000 which has gone through.

Mr. THOMAS. Then this \$17,000,000 will make it \$68,000,000 in all?

Mr. WARREN. No; this will make it \$51,000,000, or a little more.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, if we increase it by the amendment, it will be \$256,000,000 in all. Then there is the soldiers' bonus of \$12,000,000, making \$268,000,000. I have been informed that there are \$7,000,000 left in the Treasury unappropriated—

Mr. WARREN. I doubt that very much. I would not guarantee that even \$7,000,000 would be left.

Mr. THOMAS. So I hope it will be made \$275,000,000.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I desire to add that the amendment which I now offer is the identical amendment which was submitted on

my behalf on Saturday last by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and so ably defended by him at that time.

Mr. WARREN. I understand the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule has been set aside to enable the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to offer an amendment, but that Senator has not offered it.

Mr. CALDER. This is an amendment that I am offering now to his amendment.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] offered the amendment which he sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment which the Senator from New York has sent to the desk is supposed to be an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], which is not yet pending.

Mr. LODGE. The Chair refers to the amendment for which we suspended the rule?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I move that amendment. I supposed it would be brought before the Senate by the suspension of the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is now offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], proposing to insert section 6 in the bill. The amendment has been read heretofore. The Senator from New York now offers an amendment to the amendment, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the proposed section 6, on page 160 of the bill, in line 7, after the word "revenues," strike out the words "employees whose pay is adjustable from time to time through wage boards or similar authority to accord with the commercial rates paid locally for the same class of service" and insert in lieu thereof, after the word "compensation," in line 3, page 160, the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the increased compensation provided in this section to employees whose pay is adjusted from time to time through wage boards or similar authority shall be taken into consideration by such wage board or similar authority in adjusting the pay of such employees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. PITTMAN. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. EDGE (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. SWANSON (when Mr. GLASS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GLASS] is necessarily detained from the Senate. He is paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN].

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. Being unable to obtain a transfer, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. I have a general pair for the day with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. FERNALD. I have a general pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. On this matter I understand that he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—42.

Asbust	Gore	Lodge	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Hale	McKellar	Spencer
Calder	Harris	Moses	Stanley
Capper	Harrison	New	Swanson
Colt	Hefflin	Phelan	Trammell
Edge	Henderson	Pittman	Underwood
Fernald	Johnson, Calif.	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Keyes	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
France	Kirby	Sheppard	Wolcott
Gay	La Follette	Shields	
Gerry	Lenroot	Simmons	

NAYS—29.

Ball	Gronna	Overman	Sutherland
Beckham	Hitchcock	Phipps	Thomas
Brandegge	Jones, Wash.	Poindexter	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	Smith, Ariz.	Watson
Dial	Kenyon	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, Md.	
Frelinghuysen	Nelson	Smoot	
Gooding	Norris	Sterling	

NOT VOTING—25.

Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Myers	Sherman
Culberson	Kendrick	Newberry	Townsend
Cummins	King	Owen	Watson
Elkins	Knox	Page	Williams
Fall	McCormick	Penrose	
Glass	McLean	Pomerene	
Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary	Robinson	

So Mr. CALDER's amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question in reference to the employees of the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator from Mississippi has any amendment to offer in reference to that, I have no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator. I notice that in the provision which was brought in in the other House the Women's Bureau was included, but the Senator's committee has left it out. I was wondering if there was any reason for that.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, owing to a little temporary physical difficulty with my throat, I am unable to speak at any length. Furthermore, I should like to get this bill through.

I wish to say, however, that the Women's Bureau is given a lump-sum appropriation, and it may fix the salaries of its employees out of that lump sum, with the exception, as is applied to all other bureaus—only the Women's Bureau is accorded greater latitude—that they can have only one employee at \$5,000 per annum, one at \$3,500, and three at \$2,000 per annum. The other employees, however, can not receive compensation in excess of \$1,800 per annum. In other bureaus, of course, the employees begin with a salary of about \$1,000 per annum, and only a few of them receive as high as \$1,800 per annum. There is nothing to hinder that bureau from fixing salaries at any amount except the limitation to which I have referred, that they shall not go above \$1,800 per annum except in the case of five employees.

My experience—and I have had more than 50 years of it in the State of Wyoming—with women's government as well as men's government has been that when it comes to matters affecting them and the Government of the United States they do not ask to be raised on any dais above ordinary human beings. Under the laws of the country they have been given the vote, as in the case of the men, and have the same privileges. Now, if we want to give them greater privileges, set them up in a higher ether, and, in the case of the Women's Bureau, grant to the clerks employed by that bureau—estimable ladies, no doubt—sums in excess of the amounts received by employees in other departments, well and good. I call attention to the fact, however, that the appropriations for this bureau last year were only \$8,500.

They will probably next year amount to \$700,000 or \$800,000 if we may judge by the experience we have had in connection with the Children's Bureau, which started out with an appropriation of \$25,000, at which amount it was stated the appropriation would remain for some time, whereas they have asked for a trifle less than \$700,000 this year. That is the whole subject. I am not going to object to the amendment if the Senate sees fit to make the additional allowance, but I wish to say that if the Senate continues to act along the line it has been acting the conferees of the Senate will have a very nice time. Of course if the women are going to vote they are entitled to all the privileges of men, and if they are entitled to all the privileges of men they ought to be subject to all the requirements of men as to service, and so forth.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, in other words, the men get the bonus and consequently the women also ought to receive it. I therefore move, in line 15—

Mr. WARREN. Do not misunderstand me.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not misunderstand the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. A lump-sum appropriation has been granted for the Women's Bureau. I merely wish it understood that inasmuch as they have been granted a lump sum outside of the few restrictions to which I have referred they can fix the salaries as they please. However, I am not going to object to it, although in many instances the amendment, if adopted, will give the employees of that bureau, with the \$240 bonus, much more than the employees of other bureaus and departments receive.

Mr. HARRISON. But if the wording of this amendment is right as reported by the committee the Women's Bureau, not being excepted, as are the United States Tariff Commission and the War Risk Insurance Bureau, they will not be paid the bonus.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator knew the wage scale in force in the Women's Bureau, he would not ask for the bonus. However, I am not going to say another word; if the Senate wants to add the amendment to the bill, let it do so.

Mr. HARRISON. What I am trying to get at is why is the Women's Bureau left out.

Mr. SMOOT. Because of the fact that the salaries paid—and I have a list of them here—are such that the employees of that bureau are not entitled to a \$240 bonus; that is all.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the House committee saw fit to give the employees of the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor the bonus the same as any other bureau or department. The Senate committee has left out the Women's Bureau. So I move, on line 15, page 160, after the word "Commission" and before the word "who," that the words "the Women's Bureau" be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, last Friday I gave notice of a motion to suspend the rules for the purpose of offering an amendment, and I wonder now if the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill will not waive the point of order and allow the amendment to go to conference?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment has not been disposed of.

Mr. STERLING. I beg pardon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if I understand correctly the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from South Dakota, it is as direct a piece of legislation as anything could be. I could not occupy the position I do as chairman of the Appropriations Committee and consent to the item going into the bill and undertake to protect it in conference, as the conferees are supposed to protect the items the Senate inserts in the bill, unless the Senate may vote almost unanimously to suspend the rules—it would take a two-thirds vote to suspend them, and I do not believe we are going to do that. Consequently I must make the point of order against the amendment as being general legislation, although the object which the Senator seeks is not one that I oppose.

Mr. STERLING. I do not think it is, Mr. President. We have been considering a great deal here during this session, and, indeed, it was the burden of the discussion for several days, what relief might be afforded the farmers and stockmen of the country, to the men engaged in those basic industries; yet I think the amendment I propose is about the first practical attempt to render aid. We passed a measure reviving the War Finance Corporation, but it was considered at the time that if that bill should have any effect it would be a psychological effect.

Mr. WARREN. I suggest that the Senator pause a moment, and allow the amendment to be sent to the desk and read, and then let the Senate vote upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I want Senators to know what they are acting upon, and I do not believe they know now. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] gave notice that, under Rule XL, he would move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI, in order that he might propose to the bill the following amendment:

That the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may use not to exceed in the aggregate \$100,000,000 of the net earnings which shall be derived by the United States from the Federal reserve banks during the years 1921 and 1922, being the earnings accrued and accruing during the years 1920 and 1921, as hereinafter provided.

Immediately upon the receipt by the Treasury in 1921 of such net earnings for the year 1920, and the receipt in 1922 of such net earnings for the year 1921, the Secretary of the Treasury shall advise the Federal Farm Loan Board of the amount available for the purposes hereinafter designated, and the Federal Farm Loan Board shall thereupon immediately allot the same to the several Federal land bank districts in proportion to the needs of such districts for the purposes prescribed.

The sums so allotted to the several Federal land bank districts shall, upon the request of the Federal land bank of any district, approved by the Federal Farm Loan Board, be placed with such Federal land bank as financial agent of the Government of the United States to be used for the purpose of purchasing paper based on staple agricultural products or live stock.

Any Federal land bank as such financial agent may purchase, in the name of the Government of the United States, with the funds so deposited from banks within its district, whether members of the Federal Reserve System or not, paper based on staple agricultural products in the hands of the producer or on live stock according to regulations to be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

No loan purchased under this act and based on agricultural products shall be for a period longer than nine months, and no loan based on live stock shall be for a period longer than two years.

No Federal land bank shall purchase from any bank, under the provisions of this act, paper in an amount greater than three times the capital and surplus of the selling bank, nor shall any paper be purchased from any bank located in a reserve city: *Provided*, That the loans to any one individual from a corporation which may be purchased by any Federal land bank under the provisions of this act shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of \$10,000.

All loans purchased under the provisions of this act shall be indorsed and guaranteed unconditionally by the bank selling the same to the Federal land bank.

Loans purchased under the provisions of this act shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum payable in advance, if the loan be for a period of six months or less; if for a longer period than six months, payable semiannually in advance, but any borrower, under the provisions of this act, may be charged for the expenses incident to his loan a sum to be approved by the Federal Farm Loan Board not exceeding an amount equal to 1 per cent per annum for the period of the loan, of which one-half of 1 per cent may be retained by the indorsing bank and one-half of 1 per cent by the Federal land bank making the loan.

No loan shall be purchased by any Federal land bank, under the provisions of this act, which exceeds 65 per cent of the cash value of the staple agricultural products or live stock by which such loan is secured.

Any paper purchased by any Federal land bank as herein authorized may be by such bank renewed or extended wholly or in part and the proceeds of any paper collected may be by the proper Federal land bank reinvested as herein authorized: *Provided*, That no paper shall be so renewed, nor shall any loan be so made as to create a maturity later than January 1, 1924.

The several Federal land banks shall so administer the trust as financial agents of the Government as to complete their transactions hereunder as near as may be by January 1, 1924, and shall forthwith thereafter account for and pay over to the Treasury all moneys collected, both principal and interest.

Such money when paid into the Treasury shall be subject to the uses prescribed by the second paragraph of section 7 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, for the net earnings derived by the United States from Federal reserve banks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that the point of order is withdrawn?

Mr. WARREN. I undertook to say that a point of order would lie against the amendment, and I say now that there is not any kind of rule that would admit it; it could only be considered in the face of objection under a suspension of the rules; but rather than to take up the time of the Senate, I suggested to the Senator that if he would stop now and allow the amendment to go to a vote, and let the Senate determine the question, so far as I was concerned, I should not object. If there is to be debate upon it, however, I shall make the point of order and ask for the decision of the Chair.

Mr. STERLING. I accept that situation and do not wish to say anything further in regard to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. STERLING and Mr. SIMMONS asked for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have an amendment on the table, which I should like to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

The READING CLERK. On page 70, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

Carson City, Nev., mint: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, \$2,400; assistant assayer, \$1,400; chief clerk, \$1,400; in all, \$5,200; for wages of workmen and other employees, \$3,400; for incidental and contingent expenses, \$1,800.

Mr. WARREN. What is the total carried by the amendment?

Mr. PITTMAN. I think it is \$9,500.

Mr. WARREN. That is about two or three times as large as the amount provided for the purpose last year.

Mr. PITTMAN. No; it is about \$2,000 more than the item for last year. It is in accordance, I will say, with the estimate as contained in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator is mistaken about the estimates.

Mr. PITTMAN. No; I am not.

Mr. WARREN. I may say about the other assay offices that the department in submitting the statements and estimates did not ask, as my book shows, for anything more than was given last year; and, for that matter, the House left it out altogether. The returns of that office are very, very light, as the Senator from Nevada knows. I have no objection to its going in at the amount that they have had heretofore, if the Senator will make it that.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will state that the estimates are for \$9,600. I have a tabulation here which has been taken from the Book of Estimates, which I ask leave to file.

Mr. WARREN. The estimate is \$4,200 in all.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the Senator is looking at only a part of the items.

Mr. WARREN. The Senate can vote on it, and if it wants to have it go in, all right.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator that at the assay office at Boise the assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, is put in the bill at \$1,800, and the same officer at Helena at \$1,800, and at Salt Lake City \$1,800. I suggest that the Senator make the salaries in his amendment correspond to those. I think he has much higher salaries.

Mr. PITTMAN. I simply took the estimates as the basis.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes, I know; but the committee, I think, has cut down the estimates in these other places, and I understand that the business of this office is not any greater than it is in Helena and Boise, and I was just suggesting that the Senator make his salaries correspond.

Mr. PITTMAN. I consent to that. I will change my amendment in that particular. I simply want to state this for the benefit of the conference committee and for the benefit of the House conferees:

There are seven assay offices in the United States. The House reported favorably on each of them. It adopted the principle that these assay offices were of benefit to the mining industry of the country.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator please tell me what he proposes for the man in charge? What is the assayer's salary as the Senator proposes it?

Mr. PITTMAN. One thousand eight hundred dollars. That is what it has been all the time.

Mr. WARREN. And what are the others?

Mr. PITTMAN. The others are \$1,400 and \$1,200.

As I was stating, the House has adopted a policy of maintaining these assay offices. For a good many years there has been a constant dispute as to whether these assay offices should be maintained.

Mr. WARREN. Did the Senator say that the House had adopted that policy?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes, sir. The House in this bill struck out only one of the seven assay offices.

Mr. WARREN. I thought the Senator said the House had insisted upon it.

Mr. PITTMAN. No; only one.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator thinks there is business enough in that office, let it go in. I am not going to talk about it further.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am going to take just a very few minutes in trying to aid the committee, but I want to understand that it is going in to stay in.

Mr. WARREN. What does the Senator mean by that?

Mr. PITTMAN. I mean by that that I want the House committee conferees, who evidently did not understand the situation, to have these data that I have in my hand. That is the only reason why I am trespassing upon the time of the chairman of the committee, and I shall be very brief about it; but I say that if any assay office in the United States is entitled to exist and to be maintained, the one at Carson City is. It is located in one of the greatest mineral States of the country. It is where there is more gold and silver produced than almost anywhere else in the country; and if the House is to maintain assay offices—and it has provided for the maintenance of six of them—then I say that in justice it must maintain this one.

That is all I have to say about the matter. I offer this tabulated statement to show that the assay office in Carson City is equal to any of those that the House has provided for.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Estimates.		Appropriations.
	1920	1921	
Carson.....	\$5,600	\$9,600	(1)
New Orleans.....	11,750	12,150	(1)
Boise, Idaho.....	6,200	7,400	\$7,500
Salt Lake.....	3,300	3,900	3,900
Deadwood.....	6,000	8,000	\$7,200

¹ None.

² By Senate.

Number deposit.

Carson City.....	277	Salt Lake.....	160
New Orleans.....	492	Deadwood.....	79
Carson City.....	277	Helena.....	322

	Income.	Expenses.	Loss.
Carson.....	\$728.70	\$8,427.96	\$7,699.26
New Orleans.....	1,440.83	17,393.74	15,952.91
Boise.....	922.69	8,954.03	8,031.34
Salt Lake.....	743.49	4,171.83	3,428.34
Deadwood.....	760.85	8,162.91	7,402.06
Seattle.....	3,010.95	37,884.43	34,873.48
Helena.....	483.53	9,667.09	9,183.56

The VICE PRESIDENT. How does the amendment stand now?

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask to have the Secretary state it.

The READING CLERK. On page 70, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

Carson City, Nev., Mint: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, \$1,800; assistant assayer, \$1,200; chief clerk, who shall also perform the duties of cashier, \$1,400; in all \$4,400.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON. I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 73, lines 16 and 17, after the words "except the following," it is proposed to insert the words "chief clerk, at \$2,500; clerks —," making the paragraph read:

Office of Chief of Air Service: For employees in the office of the Chief of the Air Service, \$350,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum except the following: Chief clerk at \$2,500; clerks—3 at \$2,400 each, 3 at \$2,250 each, and 3 at \$2,000 each.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, this amendment does not carry any additional appropriation. It simply provides for a chief clerk of the Air Service, who to-day receives \$2,500, who entered the War Department in October, 1905, and who has been in the Air Service since October, 1913.

Mr. WARREN. I have no objection to the Senator's amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: After the amendment in regard to the Seattle passport bureau, on page 33, inserted on Saturday, I move to insert:

Key West, Fla., passport bureau: For salaries and expenses of maintenance, passport bureau, \$3,500.

The bureaus provided for on Saturday were at New York, San Francisco, and Seattle, and in each instance they carried \$7,500. I am only asking that \$3,500 be appropriated here, because I think the expense can be met with that sum. Key West is a very important port and the travel to Cuba and other points in the South passes through that port.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber on Saturday afternoon when the committee agreed to section 4 of the bill. That is the section having to do with typewriting machines. I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which that amendment was agreed to, so that I may offer an amendment to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. WARREN. I object to reconsidering the vote. If the Senator has amendments, he can offer them; but there is no reason why we should reconsider the whole matter.

Mr. CALDER. Then I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 156, beginning on line 12, it is proposed to strike out all the balance of the page and lines 1 to 9, inclusive, on page 157, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 4. That no part of any money appropriated by this or any other act shall be used during the fiscal year 1922 for the purchase of any typewriting machines (except bookkeeping, billing, and book-recording machines) at a price in excess of 70 per cent of the list price of such machine as now fixed and established by the manufacturer thereof; such price shall include the value of any typewriting machine or machines given in exchange.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Nothing can be done about that unless the vote whereby the committee amendment was agreed to is reconsidered. Does the Senator move to reconsider the vote?

Mr. CALDER. I do, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I am sure that if the Senate had understood the matter which I proposed to offer the vote would have been different; but I propose to explain the matter, and then, when the bill is in the Senate, I shall endeavor to submit the motion again.

There is no article in this bill or in any other legislation enacted by Congress that attempts to fix definitely the price of a commodity. At the beginning of the war—in fact, several years before the war—we fixed the price at which typewriters could be bought for the Government. We have continued that method, despite the fact that the price of practically every commodity purchased by the Government has increased. If we continue this legislation, we fix a definite price at which typewriters may be purchased. My amendment provides that the Government shall not pay more than 30 per cent less than the list price of a typewriting machine. That is at least 15 per cent less than the price at which any other concern or individual purchases these machines.

It seems to me most unjust that a great industry like the typewriter-manufacturing industry should be put in the position of having the Congress definitely fix the price at which these machines may be purchased, which is, as I said before, at least 15 per cent less than the price at which they are sold to any other concern in any quantities whatever; and I want to go on record as saying that I think it is an outrage that this limitation should be continued.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, on the 2d of February, on behalf of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], I offered an amendment which was not favorably acted upon by the committee. I now have a letter from the senior Senator from Illinois asking me to offer the amendment in the Senate. I therefore send it to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to add to the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That on and after March 4, 1921, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioners from Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands shall be at the rate of \$12,000 per annum; and that the compensation of the Vice President and of the heads of the executive departments who are members of the President's Cabinet shall be at the rate of \$15,000 per annum.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, he writes me to re-offer it in the Senate, as I now have done; and in his letter he says this:

I hope the salary increase will be added as an amendment. Congress cheapens itself by allowing bureau and board members created by legislative breath to draw larger salaries than the men who created them. If it be said that a Member of Congress is compensated by the honor, then reduce the present salary and let the honor be the pay. Membership in either House will then be composed of the affluent and the adventurer—one who can stand it to serve for nothing and the other who can not be any worse off anyhow than he then is. The public can not any more get something for less than it is worth than the private individual can.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire on behalf of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WARREN. I presume the Senator does not wish to cut me off from a word or two.

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly not.

Mr. WARREN. There is no question, of course, but that the salaries of Members of Congress in both Houses are exceedingly low as compared with salaries received in former years. There is not any question but what there are those in positions which, as the Senator says, we helped to create, who draw greater

salaries than we do. But I have seen this matter tried three times, once with success and twice without, and of course, in order to have it a success there must be some work done between the House and the Senate beforehand. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations has taken it up with the chairman of the corresponding committee in the House, and has received no encouragement whatsoever, and I fear that the inclusion of it would lead to damage rather than to good. Of course, it is not estimated for, because naturally salaries provided by law are not estimated for, any more than are the salaries of our employees. But it is a delicate subject to handle, and it can be handled only when both Houses are in accord.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not very difficult for me to handle it. I make a point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 115, after line 19, insert the following:

South Dakota: Surveyor general, \$2,000; clerks, \$3,100; contingent expenses, \$200; in all, \$5,300.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I ask that the telegram which I send to the desk may be read in connection with the offer of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the telegram.

The telegram was read as follows:

Senator THOMAS STERLING,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

This office should be continued until regular surveys in Black Hills are completed and plats made in this office. There are nearly 2,000 mining surveys and 600 homestead surveys to be shown on segregation plats of township surveys now being made in the field, which plats should be made while the records are held intact in this office. It would be a serious mistake to close the office before this particular work is completed. It may require three more years to execute the field and office work.

W. A. LYNCH, Surveyor General.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, this amendment provides for an appropriation of only \$5,300. The appropriations for various surveyors' general offices throughout, as I find them, run from \$14,000 to \$27,000 or \$28,000.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office thinks this office should be maintained in existence for three or four years, anyhow, in order that the business might be closed out.

Mr. WARREN. I am not objecting to the amendment. Let it go to a vote.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 107, line 16, strike out the proviso and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$2,000 per annum, except 2 actuaries, 1 at \$3,000 and 1 at \$2,400.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if we are going to open up the question of revising and raising salaries in every department, we may as well quit.

Mr. STERLING. May I say to the Senator from Wyoming that this does not increase the appropriation one cent.

Mr. WARREN. But it raises the salaries of these men.

Mr. STERLING. It allows a readjustment to meet the actual needs.

Mr. WARREN. It raises the salaries of the employees.

Mr. STERLING. I send to the desk to have read an extract from a letter of the director of the service. I think it is most convincing, and will convince the Senator from Wyoming.

The reading clerk read as follows:

The reason for the change is that the best legal examiners, medical examiners, and reviewers in the Pension Bureau proper receive compensation at the rate of \$1,800 and \$2,000 per annum. With the present restriction in the appropriation the retirement division is at a disadvantage because the employees in this division realize that there is little chance for them to get beyond \$1,740, consequently they become dissatisfied and ask to be transferred to other divisions, where they may have opportunity to be promoted to \$1,800 or \$2,000.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have two amendments to offer, by which I want to save a little money. I do not know whether they will be agreed to or not. I offer one amendment on page 100, following line 9. At first blush it seems to be an appropriation, but I will say to the Senate that if it is agreed to, we will

take all of the Shipping Board out of the building now rented on F Street and it will go into the new Navy Building. The Secretary of the Navy has told me that he could get along with \$75,000 to arrange the building so that we can put the whole of the Shipping Board there, and we will save \$86,000 a year by doing it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 100, after line 9, insert the following:

To enable the Secretary of the Navy to install certain fittings and make such necessary changes, alterations, and improvements in the new Navy Building, Seventeenth and B Streets NW., as will provide sufficient office space for the accommodation of the United States Shipping Board, \$75,000, or so much as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. In behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] I offer the following amendment, and ask that the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury be read. The adoption of the amendment would also save the Government money.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to insert in the proper place:

That in consideration of an ordinance passed by the city council of the city of Chicago on February 4, 1921, giving to the United States the use and maintenance for 20 years from July 1, 1921, of certain premises in the city of Chicago for barge-office quarters, upon terms and conditions therein set forth, and payment to the United States of the appraised value of the land to be condemned, such value to be not less than \$25.50 per square foot, the city of Chicago is hereby authorized to acquire for street purposes by condemnation proceedings all interest of the United States in and to lot 10 in block 2 in Fort Dearborn Addition to Chicago, section 10, township 39 north, range 14 east, of the third principal meridian, in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury may be read.

The letter was read, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 11, 1921.

Senator MEDILL McCORMICK,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your communication of the 11th instant, relative to the desire of the city of Chicago to obtain, through condemnation proceedings, certain property now owned by the United States in said city, known as the barge office site.

It is the understanding of this department that the bill which accompanied your letter and as drawn does not express the agreement which the department and the city authorities are willing to make, namely, that in addition to giving a lease of the property for 20 years for use as a barge office the city proposed to pay also the market value of the land condemned, and the proposed legislation will be acceptable to this department if there is inserted in line 9 of said bill (after the clause "upon terms and conditions therein set forth") the words "and payment to the United States of the appraised value of the land to be condemned, such value to be not less than \$25.50 per square foot."

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON, Secretary.

Mr. SMOOT. That will amount to about \$30,000, and the Government will get the house near the end of the bridge to take care of the employees now being taken care of elsewhere.

Mr. WARREN. I know nothing about it. I am willing that it should go to conference.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. I reserve the right to offer an amendment touching the Women's Bureau in the Senate.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 149, line 15, strike out the proviso which ends with line 18.

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to say just a word in regard to this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. May the amendment be read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 149, line 15, strike out the proviso which ends on line 18. The proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum, except the following: One at \$5,000, one at \$3,500, and three at \$2,000 each.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I have been informed that this proviso will very seriously cripple the work of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor. Not only so, but it is a discrimination against the women who are working in that bureau, if we consider the salaries of men in other bureaus who are doing similar work, and, of course, that would be a manifest injustice.

It would prevent the payment of any salary in excess of \$1,800 except to the director and assistant director, and to

three others at \$2,000 each. There is in the bureau a highly skilled woman, who is an industrial supervisor. She at present is receiving \$3,000, and is an industrial economist, an expert.

Mr. SMOOT. She is the supervisor in the field, and she gets \$3,000.

Mr. FRANCE. She would not get \$3,000 if this proviso is adopted. Her salary would be reduced from \$3,000 to \$1,800.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is mistaken about a reduction to \$1,800, I think, because \$2,000 is the salary given.

Mr. SMOOT. They have the bonus of \$240, which makes \$2,240 the amount the supervisor would get.

Mr. FRANCE. She might possibly be included among those who are to receive a salary of \$2,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, she would be included.

Mr. FRANCE. It is manifestly impossible for a woman who is now receiving \$3,000 to consider continuing her work at \$2,000.

Mr. SMOOT. She will continue her work all right, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. FRANCE. I hope she will.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt about it. If she does not, there are many others, who are just as capable, who will do it.

Mr. FRANCE. It is a great discrimination against her, when there are experts in other departments, men, who are receiving more than \$3,000 for similar work.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say, Mr. President, that we have men all over the United States, in the Interior Department, having charge of millions and millions and millions of acres of public land, who get \$2,650 each, and now it is proposed to pay a woman as supervisor in this little bureau \$3,000, or more than we are giving men who have been in the service for years and years, and have qualified themselves for it. We have to be consistent, at least.

Mr. FRANCE. I feel that this is a matter which has been left to the Secretary heretofore, and that we may seriously cripple the work of the Women's Bureau if we do not strike out this proviso. I have mentioned the effect which it would have upon the salary of the industrial supervisor.

There is one assistant industrial supervisor who is drawing a salary of \$2,500. Of course she would be reduced to \$2,000 if the proviso remains in the bill. There are also two industrial matrons at \$2,200 each and their salaries will be reduced. There is also one editor who is drawing \$2,200. I feel that the proviso should be stricken out if the work of the Women's Bureau is to be continued with efficiency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Montana in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, in this same connection I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. After the word "each," in line 18, page 149, insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That nothing contained in this act shall prevent the employees in the Women's Bureau from obtaining the \$240 bonus under the same restrictions provided for other employees.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I have offered this amendment from my own investigation and from admissions made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. In making provision for the bonus for the various departments they have omitted to make provision for a bonus for the Women's Bureau. I can not understand the reason for that at all.

Mr. WARREN. Does not the Senator appreciate that the sundry civil bill and the pending bill are full of lump-sum appropriations which are divided among the employees as they see fit to divide them? This is a case where \$75,000 is given to the women for them to divide as they see fit, except that they are restrained in the granting of salaries above \$1,800 to a certain number, which gives the management the necessary high-class assistants, some seven in number.

Mr. HARRISON. The same situation presents itself touching the Women's Bureau as in the case of the Tariff Commission. Both the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Appropriations saw fit to make an exception of the United States Tariff Commission and the War Risk Insurance Bureau. All the other departments are provided for.

Mr. WARREN. They are not, by any manner of means, and the Senator should know that.

Mr. HARRISON. The employees of the various departments, as a rule, get the \$240 bonus.

Mr. WARREN. They do when the statute provides it, but those departments or bureaus having lump-sum appropriations fix their own salaries.

Mr. HARRISON. The Tariff Commission comes under a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. WARREN. The Tariff Commission, as the Senator knows, is an old commission. They sent to the committee a list of their salaries so that we could see just what they are. It was a question for them to determine whether to increase the salaries or whether we should include a bonus, and it was determined to fix it as we have done.

Mr. HARRISON. Under this provision they would not be allowed to pay the \$240 bonus to those employees.

Mr. SMOOT. Nor do we allow employees of the Vocational Board to be paid the bonus of \$240. We do allow the employees of the War Risk Insurance Bureau to be paid \$120, because when an examination was made of the salaries paid in the War Risk Bureau, we found that it took \$120 to make them equal to the \$240 bonus that was paid in the older departments. The Women's Bureau employees are paid from a lump-sum appropriation, and there is no necessity for a provision to make them equal. The salary is a matter for the Women's Bureau to determine.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the Committee on Appropriations investigate the matter of the Women's Bureau?

Mr. SMOOT. We have before us a list of all their salaries. Let me call the Senator's attention to some of them.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not understand the difference between the action of the House Committee on Appropriations for a bonus for the employees of the Women's Bureau and the action of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The House did not provide for this bureau, and the attention of the Senate is called to it. It is provided, on page 148, that no person shall be employed at a greater rate of compensation, except the following, and it names three officers.

Mr. WARREN. I am willing that the Senate shall vote on the amendment. I have made no objection to a vote.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that; but I can not understand why the Senate Appropriations Committee should discriminate against the Women's Bureau, in the Labor Department, that has been provided for quite recently, making in that case an exception as to the bonus. The Senator knows that unless provision is made giving a right to pay the bonus the employees in the Women's Bureau will be cut out just that much.

Mr. SMOOT. They have no right to it under the existing law. We are not cutting out anything. There has been no bonus granted to them because they were paid their salaries out of the lump-sum appropriation as the department saw fit to fix them. If we incorporate this provision in the bill, it means \$240 more to each of them.

Mr. HARRISON. Did not the Women's Bureau get the bonus the last time?

Mr. SMOOT. No; they did not.

Mr. HARRISON. They have never received any bonus?

Mr. SMOOT. No; this is the first time that the attempt is made.

Mr. HARRISON. Then that makes me stronger than ever for the proposition. I can not understand why we should give this bonus to other bureaus and not provide the Women's Bureau with the bonus.

Mr. SMOOT. Because they are receiving higher salaries than those occupying similar positions.

Mr. HARRISON. The Appropriations Committee of the House did not agree with the Senate committee on that point. I have just read the provision that was incorporated in the Record of January 14, 1921, where an exception is made excepting employees of the United States Tariff Commission, the War Risk Bureau, and the Women's Bureau. The Women's Bureau is the only one that is stricken out of the provision in the bill that is now being considered. That is the reason why I offered the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	McCumber	Spencer
Beckham	Harris	McKellar	Stanley
Brandegee	Harrison	New	Sterling
Capper	Heflin	Phelan	Sutherland
Curtis	Henderson	Phipps	Thomas
Dial	Hitchcock	Pomeroy	Underwood
Fernald	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
France	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Kellogg	Simmons	Wells
Gay	Kendrick	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Gill	Kirby	Smith, S. C.	
Gloss	Knox	Smoot	

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GROENNA], the

Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] are absent on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Assistant Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. POINDEXTER, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia answered to their names when called.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KEYES, Mr. COLT, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. DILLINGHAM, and Mr. GOODING entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Fifty-five Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMOOT. Just one word to the Senate while there are a few Senators present.

Mr. President, we are going perfectly wild. I wish to say to the Senate that I have here a list of the employees of the Women's Bureau, from which I find that messengers are paid \$1,080. What is the statutory salary of a messenger? It is \$840. What have those in charge of the Women's Bureau done? They have \$240 added to the salary of messenger, making it \$1,080, and it is now asked that there be added to that salary \$240 more, or a salary for messengers in the Women's Bureau of \$1,320. Are we going crazy? Had not we better stop and think?

The salary of the chief clerk of the Women's Bureau is \$2,700. I find in other departments and bureaus, for instance under the Inspector General, that a chief clerk receives a salary of \$2,000, and under the Judge Advocate General a chief clerk receives \$2,500; and yet in the Women's Bureau the salary of the chief clerk is \$2,700. I think we had better call a halt. If Senators want to vote for such discrimination, well and good, but let it be done with their eyes open.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to ask the Senator a question. The Senator cites a case where some one is getting \$2,000 a year, as I understood.

Mr. SMOOT. To what does the Senator refer?

Mr. HARRISON. To the case just cited by the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I can cite such instances all through the bill. The chief clerk in the Navy Department is receiving \$2,250.

Mr. HARRISON. But we are talking about the Women's Bureau now. We have passed the naval proposition; the Senate disagreed with the Senator from Utah by a vote of 5 to 1 and settled the matter as to the employees of the Navy.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not what I am speaking of. I am speaking about the statutory roll of the Navy Department.

Mr. HARRISON. That has nothing to do with the Women's Bureau. We are discussing the Women's Bureau now.

Mr. SMOOT. But I cited facts to show the Senator from Mississippi the salaries paid in the Navy Department.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has cited a case where one employee got over \$2,000. On page 149 of the bill there is written into the bill the following proviso:

That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum except the following: One at \$5,000, one at \$3,500, and three at \$2,000 each.

So that safeguards the matter. That provision is in the bill, and the bureau could not hope to override that.

Mr. SMOOT. The bureau can not exceed that number in fixing salaries over \$1,800.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course not.

Mr. SMOOT. But they can include the chief clerk in that number and pay her more, and that is what it is done for. I ask the Senator does he believe that the chief clerk of the Women's Bureau ought to be paid \$2,700, when the chief clerks of the bureaus in the Navy Department only receive \$2,250, and some of them only \$2,000?

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator think, in view of the proviso as to the Women's Bureau, if the present chief clerk receives \$2,500 and we should include the Women's Bureau in the exceptions, so that the employees there should get the bonus of \$240, the same as in other bureaus, that the chief clerk would get more than \$2,740?

Mr. SMOOT. I can tell the Senator in a moment.

Mr. HARRISON. The entire provision as to the Women's Bureau as written in the bill is as follows:

Women's Bureau: For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the Women's Bureau," approved June 5, 1920, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of material for reports and educational exhibits, and traveling ex-

penses, \$75,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum except the following:

Then three are excepted specifically, so that no employees can be paid more than \$1,800 except those three.

Mr. WARREN. There are five excepted altogether.

Mr. HARRISON. I am reading the language which was incorporated in the bill by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WARREN. Then read it correctly, please.

Mr. HARRISON. I have read it correctly.

Mr. WARREN. The exceptions are "one at \$5,000, one at \$3,500, and three at \$2,000 each."

Mr. HARRISON. There are three provided for at \$2,000 each. Those who get \$1,800 can not be increased over \$1,800 by bonus or otherwise because of the limitation that is provided in the clause.

Mr. SMOOT. Even under the provisions of the House bill the Women's Bureau could pay messengers \$1,800.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but I have more faith in the Women's Bureau than to believe they would do that.

Mr. SMOOT. They are paying those they have now \$1,080, while on the statutory roll the salary is \$840. If the Senator's amendment is adopted, it will add \$240 to the \$1,080, so if the \$240 is added messengers will receive a total bonus of \$480.

Mr. HARRISON. What the committee proposes to do here—there can not be any doubt about it—is to make no exception, as is done in the case of the Tariff Commission and the War Risk Bureau and other bureaus, so that the employees of the Women's Bureau shall not get the \$240 bonus. They should be placed upon the same basis as the other bureaus and departments of the Government. There is no reason why we should discriminate against the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor.

Mr. SMOOT. If that is the Senator's position, then why does he not go back to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to all other bureaus the employees of which have their salaries paid from lump-sum appropriations and try to have the same action taken in those cases? We have decided that question.

Mr. HARRISON. The bonus has been allowed to other bureaus for which lump sums are provided, and there is no reason why a discrimination should be made against this particular bureau, especially when the committee has written in the limitation which we find on page 149.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, then we have discriminated, if discrimination it can be called—which I deny—against the Vocational Education Board; we have given them no bonus. Why? Because the salaries paid to the employees of that board without the bonus are equalized with the salaries paid to employees on the statutory roll plus the \$240 bonus. The employees of the War Risk Insurance Bureau are paid a bonus of \$120 instead of \$240. Why? Because the salaries paid to those employees, together with the \$120 bonus, equalize the salaries paid to employees on the statutory roll plus the \$240 bonus.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Utah when was the Women's Bureau established by law?

Mr. SMOOT. It was established on June 5, 1920.

Mr. WARREN. It was established last year, and at that time we appropriated for the bureau \$8,500.

Mr. HARRISON. That is the reason why the Women's Bureau is in a different position from the other bureaus. The Vocational Education Board was established a considerable time ago, the War Risk Insurance Bureau was established a number of years ago, and the salaries in those organizations have been adjusted; but the Women's Bureau was established only last year—on June 5, 1920. Now, it is proposed by this act to give the bonus to practically all other bureaus in the various departments and leave them out. If that is your position, stand up to it and vote against my amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is just what I want to do.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 49 Senators present; so that it will require 10 Senators to second the demand for the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will raise their hands and the Secretary will count. [A pause.] The Secretary advises the Chair that there is not a sufficient number to order the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask, Mr. President, that the other side be counted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will please raise their hands and hold them up until the Secretary counts.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, is this a vote on the entire proposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the count is made to ascertain if the demand for the yeas and nays is supported. The Secretary reports eight hands up.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the other side, so that we may see if one-fifth of the Senators present have seconded the demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WARREN. That is not the rule; the Chair is following the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not a sufficient number of hands are up to second the demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARRISON. I reserve the right to offer the amendment when the bill is reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have that right. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 5, line 26, to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "thirty-seven."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 5, line 26, it is proposed to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "thirty-seven," so as to read:

Thirty-seven (including one for minority), at \$1,440 each.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I offer that amendment for the purpose of placing Mr. M. H. Bumphrey, who has served twenty-odd long years in the employ of the Senate, on the old soldiers' roll, from which roll he was omitted while serving temporarily for the Senator from Michigan in connection with a monetary conference. When the time came for the financial clerk of the Senate to make up the roll of the old soldiers, for the first time the name of Mr. Bumphrey was left out by order of the then financial clerk, Mr. Nixon. Mr. Bumphrey was a soldier during the Civil War and suffered intensely as a result of wounds received in action at that time. During the eight years that I have known him he has been suffering with pain incident to those wounds. He has been in the employ of the Senate, as I have said, for a quarter of a century and was left off the soldiers' roll by inadvertence.

Republican as he is, because of his great fitness to perform any duty which he was called upon to perform, I have employed him in my office under the designation of messenger, but he has really acted in no such capacity, for there is not a Senator on this floor, no matter how erudite, who would not find Mr. Bumphrey perfectly qualified to be of immense service to him.

Mr. Bumphrey is one of the very best and most reliable men with whom I am acquainted. He can do anything that anybody else can do in the way of hunting up authorities and securing statistical information of any kind. He is a historian, a student, and a hard-working man. Now, in his old age, after all these years in the service of the Senate, he is cut off of the roll, and other men are left on it who are no more worthy than he.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator says that if his amendment is agreed to a man by the name of Bumphrey will be added to the roll, but there is nothing in the amendment to give the Senator that assurance.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am making this statement here so that those who have the matter in charge will know the purpose of the amendment. There has never been any difficulty in having the proper man appointed under such circumstances.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know if we adopt the amendment that it is going to benefit the man whom the Senator has in mind.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I will take my chances as to that.

Mr. THOMAS. I will not; I will vote against the amendment. SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to reserve a separate vote in the Senate on the Senate amendment at the foot of page 27 in relation to the salary of the Vice President.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. At the end of line 18, on page 128, it is proposed to add the following:

Provided further, That hereafter no reports obtained by the Bureau of the Census of cotton ginned shall be sent by telegraphic messages.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I shall not raise any point of order on the amendment if the Senate is ready to take a vote.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am ready to take the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. THOMAS. I call for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for. Those in favor of the amendment will rise. [A pause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. I understood the Chair to announce that the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair did not announce that it was agreed to. A division has been called for.

Mr. HEFLIN. It is a good amendment, Mr. President, and I do not believe that there will be any opposition to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order while a division is being had.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am sure the Senator from Colorado does not understand the amendment. I feel that he would not vote against it if he understood it. It will save the Government money that is now being expended for a useless purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment again.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend by adding at the end of line 18, on page 128, the following words:

Provided further, That hereafter no reports obtained by the Bureau of the Census of cotton ginned shall be sent by telegraphic messages.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I trust the Senate will indulge me for just a moment.

These reports are sent in by eight hundred or a thousand gin reporters. The law now requires that these reports shall be mailed to the Director of the Census. They are gathered by the gin reporter, sealed, and by him are sent through the mails. In addition to that, this same agent or gin reporter sends the same report by wire. Now, I am trying to do away with the telegraphic report. There is no necessity for it. I hold that whenever you send these messages over the wire you are exposing this secret information and defeating the very purpose of the act which proposes to safeguard this information.

The New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges can get this information now before the department gets it, and yet the law provides a penalty for anyone giving out such information before the Government publishes it. I repeat that this information, when sent by wire, is liable to be disclosed to certain interests. Again let me say, there is no good reason for sending these reports by wire. When the gin reporter wires this information to the department here the same information is sent through the mails properly sealed, and when it arrives it is opened behind closed doors, and they guard it very carefully to see that nobody sees what this information is; and yet they have flashed that same information over the wires from 820 counties in the cotton-growing States, and I contend that the only way to keep this information secret, as the law intended it should be kept, is to send it properly sealed through the mails. I have talked to the Director of the Census about it, and he says that if we want to change the system and rely entirely on the mail service he can do it in that way; and I want to say to the Senate that in doing it this way we will throw the proper safeguards around this information. We have statutes right here in this book that impose a penalty upon any agent of the department who gives out information upon this subject to anybody until it is published by the department as required by law. The opportunity exists and the inducement is strong for interested speculators to obtain this information when sent over the wires. So it is in the interest of economy and for the purpose of safeguarding this service that I ask that this amendment may be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. WARREN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I simply wish to suggest that the only effect of the Senator's amendment, so far as I can see, will be to substitute the telephone for the telegraph.

Mr. HEFLIN. No; we do not receive it by telephone now. It is received by telegraph.

Mr. THOMAS. But it will be if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I will modify the amendment by making it read "telegraphic messages or by telephone."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The Senator wishes to insert, at the proper place, the word "telephone"?

Mr. HEFLIN. I make that modification, and I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, it seems to me this is clearly new legislation, and I therefore make the point of order against it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is not new legislation. It is merely laying down the rules and regulations by which this information shall be obtained.

Mr. GAY. It is legislation on an appropriation bill, as I understand it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I trust that the Senator from Louisiana will not insist on his point of order. This is a very meritorious measure and it will safeguard the interests of Louisiana as well as the interests of the people of the other cotton-growing States.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. GAY. The amendment may have merit, and I am not prepared to say that it has not; but I think that it is very hasty action on an important piece of legislation, and one on which I think we should hear from the other side. I am not a cotton expert, as is the Senator from Alabama, and I have not heard any complaint as to the method of receiving these reports. It seems to me that to do away with the system of telegraphing these reports into Washington, to delay them until they can be received by letter, would be a hardship on those engaged in this business, and also on the Government. I think we ought to get this news as quickly as possible. It is a very important matter.

The Senator, I realize, knows more about cotton, perhaps, than many of the other Senators do, but I do not think we should take such hasty action on this matter without having more facts presented to us.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator—

Mr. WARREN. I ask for a ruling on the point of order, unless the Chair wishes to have some further information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will be glad to hear the Senator from Alabama for a minute or two.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I just want to say this: These men already send these reports in by mail, I will say to the Senator from Louisiana, and this is a duplication of the work. They send them by wire and send them by mail; and I submit that sending them by wire is not necessary and opens up the whole thing to exposure to speculating parties interested. Anybody listening over the wire can get the information. Any agent along the route can get it. It is already mailed, now; it comes properly sealed to the department and is then opened, as I have said, behind closed doors. Now, why should this be done if the same information is sent by telegraphic message?

I want to say this before I sit down, Mr. President: The present method of wiring this information in to the department supplies the cotton gamblers of this country with information to which they are not entitled until published as provided by law. It subjects this whole system to exposure to them, to the detriment and injury of every cotton grower in Louisiana and every cotton grower in the cotton-producing States; and it is in the interest of honest service that I make this appeal, and in the interest of economy that I ask that this amendment be adopted. No harm can come to any legitimate interest; but the failure to enact it leaves it open, and permits the gamblers to feast upon information that they have no right to have until the Government publishes it.

Mr. GAY. I take it, then, that this is a part of the Senator's program of legislation against the exchanges of the country; is it?

Mr. HEFLIN. This is not against the exchanges that desire to do right. I am in favor of permitting exchanges to run if they can be regulated; but I should like to say to the Senator now that if he and others undertake to defeat such legislation as this, I favor passing in the extra session a measure that will require the exchanges to put their houses in order. If the Senator is willing to block legislation of this character now, he may force us to stricter regulatory measures later on in the spring.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands, however, that the Senator from North Dakota is making a point of order.

Mr. McCUMBER. I make the point of order that the arguments are not in explanation of any rule, but are on the merits of the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true.

Mr. McCUMBER. And I ask that the Chair rule on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invited the Senator from Alabama to speak for a moment or two.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. GAY. I want to say to the Senator from Alabama that I am not here defending the cotton exchanges or any other class of individuals, particularly those whom the Senator describes as gamblers. I know nothing of the dealings in cotton futures, but I say that I know that the Senator has had a hobby to regulate the exchanges. He may be right, but I do not want to see legislation like this passed hurriedly. I think it is a matter on which we ought to have full hearings. The Senator's predecessor here [Mr. Comer] had legislation of this same sort—to regulate the exchanges.

Mr. GORE. I call for the regular order.

Mr. GAY. There were hearings before the Agricultural Committee. We had an address from the Senator's predecessor almost every day for a number of days. While he may be absolutely correct in the position he is taking, this is no place to put such legislation. It should come in as a separate measure.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule at any time.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I just want to offer a word of explanation—just a sentence. This has no relation to any of the exchanges. The Census Bureau say that they get their monthly or semimonthly ginners' reports by wire, and then, later on, the same reports come in by letter. They say they get them by wire in order to expedite the tabulation at the half month, and then if there is any error they correct it. The Senator from Alabama is complaining that these telegrams may be incorrect, and the error may be either in favor of the telegram as against the letter, or in favor of the letter as against the telegram; and he is insisting that there should be but one mode of transmitting the statistics, namely, in a sealed envelope, and have the reporters get the statistics in Washington by mail in time to make the tabulation, and not use the telegraph. It has no reference whatever to the exchanges.

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, no; it has no reference to the exchanges along that line.

Mr. McCUMBER. I insist on the point of order—that the matter is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true; but the Chair invited a moment of discussion.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; but, Mr. President, let me suggest to the Chair that none of the arguments are on the rule, but they are upon the merits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is aware of that.

Mr. McCUMBER. And that is not what the Chair desires to hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. HEFLIN. I was trying to get the Senator from Louisiana, in the interests of the cotton producers, to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. I want to be heard, merely on the point of order, for not over two minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hear the Senator for a very brief time, but he is ready to rule.

Mr. HARRISON. This is merely a limitation on the appropriation. The Senate, time and time again, has made proper provision for this. I recall some appropriation, I think for the Navy, where it was provided that the stop-watch system should not be used, and provisions in regard to the eight-hour day law, and those various things—merely a limitation directing how the money shall be expended—and that is all this proviso does:

Provided further, That hereafter no reports obtained by the Bureau of the Census of cotton ginned shall be sent by telegraphic and telephonic messages.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, may I be permitted to say just a word? I really do not understand very well the point before the Senate. This is a matter that has been going on for some time, and it seems to me Senators from the cotton States ought to be allowed to investigate before you spring a thing of that kind and pass on it instantaneously when it is offered as an amendment to a great appropriation bill. I hope the Senator from Alabama will not insist upon his amendment. It may be a good thing, and I may help him in it when I have had a chance to look into it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Now is the time to look into it.

Mr. RANDELL. I do not look into a thing instant, on the floor of the Senate, when it is brought up in this way.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wants to be courteous to every Senator, but in the opinion of the Chair the amendment is subject to a point of order, because Rule XVI, under paragraph 3 thereof, provides that—

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment proposes general legislation, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I will strike from my amendment the word "hereafter," which makes it subject to a point of order, and offer it in that way.

Mr. WARREN. That does not help it any.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can offer that amendment after the bill gets into the Senate. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, except one reserved for a separate vote in the Senate.

The amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment reserved for a separate vote in the Senate will be stated by the Secretary.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 27, line 24, under the item for salary of the Vice President of the United States, it was proposed and the Senate as in Committee of the Whole agreed to strike out "\$12,000" and insert "\$15,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the committee amendment.

Mr. GORE. I offer an amendment to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Oklahoma proposes to insert the following:

Provided, That the present incumbent of the office of Vice President shall be paid at the same rate for the period of the Sixty-sixth Congress, for which the sum of \$6,000 is hereby appropriated and made immediately available.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. I make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the point of order?

Mr. GORE. That it is new legislation and changes the law with reference to the salary of the Vice President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit that point of order to the Senate.

Mr. GORE. There is not any question but that it is subject to a point of order, and I hope the Senate will so decide.

On a division, the Senate refused to sustain the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. I think I should say that I voted against the amendment to apply this increase of salary to the incumbent of the office because I am satisfied that he personally would be against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 5, line 26, in the item for messengers acting as assistant doorkeepers of the Senate, to strike out "thirty-six" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty-seven."

Mr. WARREN. So far as I am concerned, I am glad to consent to that. I did not object to it before and I shall not object to it now.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment, beginning on page 158, line 24, was agreed to, be reconsidered, and I move, on page 160, line 15, after the word "commission" and before the word "who," to insert "the Women's Bureau," and I ask for the yeas and nays on that. If I do not get them I will move a recommitment of the bill and try to get the yeas and nays on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment on page 158, line 24, was agreed to be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote is re-

considered. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On line 15, page 160, in the committee amendment, after the words "United States Tariff Commission" and the comma, insert the words "the Women's Bureau," so as to read:

Employees paid from lump-sum appropriations in bureaus, divisions, commissions, or any other governmental agencies or employments created by law since January 1, 1916, except employees of the United States Tariff Commission, the Women's Bureau—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On that question the Senator from Mississippi asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I have a pair for the day with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], which I transfer to the Senator from California [Mr. PHILAN], and vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], who is absent on account of illness. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], I withhold my vote.

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], and vote "nay."

Mr. KNOX. In the absence of my pair, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], I withhold my vote.

Mr. BALL. Has the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. BALL. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida, and not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GLASS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has been called from the Chamber on official business, and I have agreed to pair with him during his absence. So I withhold my vote.

Mr. EDGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], which I transfer to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and vote "yea."

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Ashurst	Hale	La Follette	Smith, S. C.
Brandegge	Harris	Lenroot	Spencer
Capper	Harrison	Lodge	Stanley
Colt	Hefflin	McKellar	Sutherland
Edge	Henderson	McLean	Trammell
Fall	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Underwood
France	Kellogg	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	Keyes	Sheppard	Wolcott
Glass	Kirby	Simmons	

NAYS—20.

Curtis	Gronna	Phipps	Smoot
Dial	McCumber	Poindexter	Sterling
Dillingham	Moses	Reed	Thomas
Gay	New	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Gooding	Overman	Smith, Ga.	Willis

NOT VOTING—41.

Ball	Cummins	Hitchcock	King
Beckham	Elkins	Johnson, Calif.	Knox
Borah	Fernald	Johnson, S. Dak.	McCormick
Calder	Fletcher	Jones, Wash.	McNary
Chamberlain	Frelinghuysen	Kendrick	Myers
Culberson	Gore	Kenyon	Nelson

Newberry
Norris
Owen
Page
Penrose

Phelan
Pomerene
Robinson
Sherman
Shields

Smith, Md.
Swanson
Townsend
Wadsworth
Walsh, Mont.

Watson
Williams

So Mr. HARRISON's amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HEFLIN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 128, at the end of line 18, the Senator from Alabama moves to add the following:

Provided further, That none of the money appropriated in this bill shall be available for obtaining from gin reporters reports of cotton ginned which are sent in by telegraphic or telephonic message.

Mr. HEFLIN. That relieves the provision of the objection raised by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY], that the matter is subject to a point of order at this time.

Mr. GAY. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment reads:

Provided further, That none of the money appropriated in this bill shall be available for obtaining from gin reporters reports of cotton ginned which are sent in by telegraphic or telephonic message.

The Chair is of the opinion that it is simply a limitation upon the appropriation made in the bill, and is therefore not subject to a point of order. The Chair will be glad to hear from the Senator from Louisiana or any other Senator.

Mr. GAY. My position is that it is legislation attached to an appropriation bill, which is in violation of Rule XVI. Of course, if the Chair has already ruled there is no necessity of discussing the matter any further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that it is simply a limitation upon the provision and is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to suggest to the Chair that the Senate has never followed that rule. It is the express rule in the House that a limitation upon an appropriation bill is in order. However, that has never been applied in the Senate, and there is no rule in the Senate which makes such an amendment in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is anxious to follow the rule in the matter, but is of the opinion that it is simply a limitation on the appropriation made in the bill, and is therefore in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for the yeas and nays. This is very important, and I want Senators to go on record on the proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter has been decided. It is too late for a roll call. The bill is in the Senate and open to further amendment.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, for the edification of the employees of the Government now in the galleries, and those on the floor from the Senate Office Building and other offices, I desire to read the law on this point.

Mr. McCUMBER. Before that is done, I wish to ask, the legislative appropriation bill being now disposed of—

Mr. SMOOT. This will take just a moment.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know; but we can take that moment after the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. In section 6 of the deficiency appropriation bill approved July 11, 1919, I find this provision:

That hereafter no part of the money appropriated by this or any other act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other

device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation—

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. Is the Senator talking to the tariff bill?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am not talking to the tariff bill, I will say to the Senator, and I thought the Senator would know that without asking the question.

Mr. GERRY. Is it possible the Senator from Utah is filibustering against the emergency tariff bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; the Senator is filibustering right now for two seconds, and I am very sorry that it pains the Senator from Rhode Island so much, because I wish to remind him that he inflicted upon the Senate a speech of four or five hours as a clear filibuster, while I shall not take longer than four or five minutes.

I continue the reading:

Any officer or employee of the United States who after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope the Senator will pardon me if I object to further discussion of that subject. I ask that the emergency tariff bill be now proceeded with.

Mr. POMERENE, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. GAY rose.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish we could go on with the bill and not something that is entirely outside of the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. I was simply going to ask a question, but if the Senator objects I will withhold it.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think one will read the record of the debate upon the sugar item in the emergency tariff bill without getting very much concrete information from it. I have been waiting patiently for those who assume an expert knowledge of the sugar industry of the country to present the effect of the emergency tariff proposition in a definite, clear statement as to just exactly what it means in added cost to the American public. I should like the attention of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Gay], both of whom represent sugar States, if I make any statement here that is not absolutely accurate.

Broad declarations that it will cost the American people hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars have had no concrete demonstration whatever. I wish, therefore, most briefly to present the actual effect of the sugar item to the Senate and to the public. What I desire to know is just exactly what additional cost this item, as proposed by the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah, will impose on the consumers of sugar in the country and just exactly what those consumers will gain by the imposition of the proposed additional duty on sugar.

I wish first to illustrate the only just and accurate method of computing the relation between added expense and increased income. Suppose we have a population of 100,000,000 people. The Government of the Nation says to its people, "We must raise for governmental necessities \$1,000,000,000; that means \$10 for each man, woman, and child; this amount of money must be actually paid by you, either in direct taxes or indirect taxes." As the consumer of the articles taxed must always pay the tax assessed against any article which he consumes, it makes no difference whatever to him whether he pays his dollar directly to the Government or pays his dollar to the Government through the customhouse. In either case he pays the dollar.

Suppose the Government in addition says, "We will collect \$100,000,000 of this \$1,000,000,000, or one-tenth of it, by levying a tax of \$100,000,000 on sugar which you consume; by doing it we do not increase your tax burden one penny, but we do gain this advantage, namely, that we keep alive and continue an industry in this country which will prevent us from being entirely at the mercy of other nations on such a necessity as sugar, and in addition will furnish a livelihood to hundreds of thousands of our own citizens, who will thereby be enabled to assist in bearing the burdens of actual taxation."

If we stopped there, it would have to be conceded that the consuming public lose nothing and the producing public gain very much in sustaining this industry by having the \$100,000,000 paid through the customhouse. Let me give the only answer.

that can be made to it—and even that answer can be explained away, or at least eliminated so that there is only a mere bagatelle of it left. For illustration, if we levy an additional tax of 1 cent per pound and if we raise one-third of our sugar only and import two-thirds of what we consume, for each dollar the Government receives the consuming public would pay \$1.50, or one-third more. That would be true if that were the proper relation between home production and importations. But let us suppose—and this supposition approximates the fact—that we raise in this country 1,500,000,000 pounds of sugar, in round numbers, and that we imported—and I will take 1919 and 1920—in round numbers, 8,500,000,000 pounds.

That would make 10,000,000,000 pounds which were raised in and imported into the United States. This, however, is the raw sugar, it is not all consumed in the United States. A portion of it is refined and exported. Now let us suppose—and again this is approximately correct—that we export of the imported sugar 1,500,000,000 pounds. That exactly equals our production and is equivalent to exporting our entire home production. We should then have these figures: Added expense to the home consumer for the actual number of pounds that he consumes, 8,500,000,000 pounds at 1 cent a pound, \$85,000,000; income from 8,500,000,000 pounds in import duties, 1 cent additional per pound, \$85,000,000.

As I have said, the American public have got to pay not only the \$85,000,000 to run the Government, but at least forty times that amount. If these were the exact figures of imports and exports, this item would cost the American people, after giving them credit for the income received, not one single penny. That these figures approximate the exact situation will be shown by the table which I ask be inserted not at the end of my remarks but at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Montana in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

PRODUCTION, IMPORTS, AND EXPORTS OF SUGAR, YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1920.		
Production in continental United States:	Pounds.	Pounds.
Cane	241,998,400	
Beet	1,452,902,000	
Total		1,694,900,400
Brought from islands now designated as noncontiguous territory of United States:		
Porto Rico	837,735,200	
Hawaii	1,056,023,998	
Philippine Islands	45,387,719	
Total		1,939,146,917
Grand total		3,634,047,317
Total imports exclusive of noncontiguous territory		7,550,195,838
Total production and imports		11,184,243,155
Total exports		1,450,793,630
Retained for consumption in continental United States		9,733,449,525
Per capita consumption in 1920 ending June 30, 1920, 91.47 pounds.		
Per capita consumption in—	Pounds.	
1909	80.81	
1910	79.77	
1911	77.24	
1912	82.68	
1913	85.32	
Five year average	81.26	
Per capita consumption in—	Pounds.	
1914	89.80	
1915	86.84	
1916	79.06	
1917	82.88	
1918	78.11	
1919	83.62	
Six year average	83.41	

Mr. McCUMBER. That is a table of production, imports, and exports of sugar for the year ending June 30, 1920, including per capita consumption for the year ending June 30, 1920; also the average per capita consumption for the normal years of 1909 to 1913, inclusive, and the per capita consumption of the somewhat abnormal years of 1914 to 1919, inclusive.

From this table it will be seen that we raised for the year ending June 30, 1920, in continental United States 1,694,900,400 pounds; that we imported from Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands 1,939,146,917 pounds; that we imported from territory outside of our possessions 7,550,195,838 pounds; making a total of importations of 9,489,342,755 pounds—and here is something that we have failed to take into consideration—of the imports we exported 1,450,793,630 pounds, leaving a balance for home consumption of 8,038,549,125 pounds.

The Smoot amendment imposes an additional tax of 1 cent per pound. In addition to this amount, which represents the

number of pounds imported exclusive of the quantity exported, the American public, of course, consumed also the home production. The home production, added to the importations and exclusive of the exportations, amounts to 1,694,900,400 pounds, or a total consumption of 9,733,449,525 pounds. This number of pounds consumed, under the proposed amendment would carry an additional cost to the consumer of 1 cent per pound, or \$97,334,495. That is exactly what the American public would pay if we should pass this bill, and it should remain in force for a year, and we should consume next year the same quantity of sugar that we consumed during the last year.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, however, that we are not going to consume that amount.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know that, but I am basing the figures upon the amount of consumption this year. Probably there will be less imported, so that the relation of one to the other will be practically the same.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wish to say in passing, for the Record, that all the figures as to importations as stated by the Senator are correct, but last year there was great speculation in sugar; it was carried on by parties all over the United States; and the consumption was not the amount as stated. It never has been that amount, I will say to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the cost would be as I have stated if we had consumed all that sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator's statement is absolutely correct. If that amount of sugar had been consumed, the result he has arrived at necessarily follows.

Mr. McCUMBER. We will assume that that amount of sugar was consumed, because in the tables it is set down as being the home consumption. From that amount, however, must be deducted the 1 cent per pound which the Government—and the Government means all the American people—received, and which the public is therefore relieved from paying in another form. One cent per pound on 9,489,342,755 pounds imported amounts to \$94,893,427 received.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator wait a moment until I make this point? I do not want to be broken in on at this time.

So the additional cost which the American public will pay for this protection to this American industry will be the difference between the added cost of 1 cent per pound on consumption and the receipt of 1 cent per pound on importations, or a loss of exactly \$2,441,068; in other words, the public will pay, if they pay 1 cent per pound additional on every pound they consume, that much more than the Government would receive for the additional 1 cent per pound on the importations.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator has failed to take into account the amount of the sugar which was imported and subsequently shipped to foreign countries; in other words, the amount of sugar that was refined in transit.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I made an allowance for that.

Mr. SMOOT. Did the Senator make an allowance for that?

Mr. McCUMBER. I made my allowance for that, and I gave the amount we exported of the refined sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the Senator's figures are correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. At what figure has the Senator placed the amount of sugar that is imported into the United States?

Mr. McCUMBER. I gave it in the table, and I am putting the table into the Record and quoting from it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Can the Senator give the amount to me, in round numbers, of course?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes. We imported from Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands 1,939,146,917 pounds, and from other territory outside of our possessions we imported 7,550,195,838 pounds, making a total of importations of 9,489,342,755 pounds.

Mr. SIMMONS. From that total the Senator subtracts the importations from our outlying possessions, for there is no duty upon those?

Mr. McCUMBER. What is the Senator's suggestion?

Mr. SIMMONS. In the table the Senator has the total of all importations, including imports from our possessions?

Mr. McCUMBER. The amendment places a duty of 1 cent a pound above the present tariff rates.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; but what I wanted to ascertain from the Senator was whether he had made his calculations to determine what per cent of the imports are subject to that duty?

Mr. McCUMBER. As I understand, the duty which will be imposed if we adopt the Smoot amendment amounts to 1 cent

additional on all sugar that is imported, including that which comes from Porto Rico and our other possessions.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not understand that at all. I understand that that duty will only apply to imports from countries other than our possessions.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I do not so understand. To be definitely certain, I asked the Senator from Utah, without looking at his amendment, and he informed me that that was the case.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from North Dakota what proportion of the importations covered by his figures consist of sugar that is imported for refinement and reexportation?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have given those figures also.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, I will get the figures from the Record. The Senator need not repeat them.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have them here. The amount was 1,450,793,630 pounds, almost equivalent to our home production.

But, Mr. President, the two and a quarter million dollars difference which I have just mentioned, between what the Government receives and what the public will pay out in added expenses for sugar, will be paid by all the public, by those who are able to pay \$2 per pound for confectionery and another dollar for a box tied with a pink ribbon or a bow, as well as those who use the plain sugar on their table in their homes. We need shed no crocodile tears because a box of candy will cost 1 cent more, if it shall cost a penny more. How are the others affected—those who buy sugar for their homes and for the tables in our restaurants? I am informed—

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment. I am informed that of the amount of sugar consumed in the United States less than 50 per cent is used in the household or on the table.

Now, let us suppose it is fully 50 per cent. Then the actual amount paid by the latter class of people will be about one and a quarter million dollars, or, in exact figures, \$1,220,534. That would be equivalent, when divided by 105,000,000 people, to an additional expense of 1.16 cents.

Mr. President, that presents the case as it would appear in an accounting between the consumer and the Government; and on the assumption that the Government must have this extra amount of about \$97,000,000, and with that character of accounting there is practically nothing lost by the consumer.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I wanted to know what proportion of the total amount of sugar consumed in this country was used in making confectionery. The Senator has already answered my question.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes. I think over 50 per cent is used in confectionery, in preserves, in canning, and so forth, and less than 50 per cent is used on the table and in the homes and in the boarding houses.

Mr. McCUMBER subsequently said: Mr. President, I want to correct an error in one item of the figures which I just gave. When I made my table I did not have before me the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah. So I asked him whether or not his amendment included the tax of 1 per cent upon the sugar imported from the Philippines, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, and he informed me that it did. He evidently did not quite comprehend my question, because he now informs me that it did not include importations from those possessions. As we imported from those possessions 1,939,146,917 pounds of sugar, it will be seen that the figures which I gave as receipts from the customhouse would be \$19,391,469 too much. Therefore, to get the statement accurate, I must add, as the amendment now stands, this \$19,391,469 to my \$2,441,068, which would give us \$21,832,537 more that it would cost the consuming public than the Government would receive from the duties, and dividing this sum by 105,000,000, our population, the actual cost to the consumer would amount to a little less than 21 cents per capita.

DECISION OF FEDERAL JUDGE LANDIS.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, on Saturday I brought to the attention of the Senate a ruling and some remarks by Judge Landis, of Chicago. In that case the defendant was brought before his court charged with having embezzled \$96,000 of the funds of the bank by which he was employed as a receiving teller. He pleaded guilty, and after inquiry it was found that he was drawing a salary of \$90 a month. The judge then said that the directors of the bank were to blame, and told the boy to go home, saying that he would send for him when he wanted him.

The reason why I brought this matter to the attention of the Senate is that United States judges hold their position by appointment of the President of the United States and by confirmation of the Senate. I feel that if this judge had expressed any such sentiments before he was confirmed by this

body he never would have been confirmed; and while it is true that perhaps we have not jurisdiction over him so far as his rulings from time to time are concerned, yet I feel that we are in a sense responsible for his acts.

It is the business of a judge to administer the law, and it is none of his affair to inquire into the compensation that people who are brought before him receive. In this case, furthermore, the judge told the boy to go home, and said that he would send for him when he wanted him. In other words, he paroled him. I conceive this to be revolutionary, certainly in a case of this magnitude; and while I do not know that he can be subjected to the criticism of suspending the enforcement of a sentence, yet it is very close to it.

Many years ago the practice in the United States courts was that after conviction the judge would sometimes suspend sentence. That was in the nature of granting a pardon; but something like three years ago a decision was rendered in the court of appeals by an Ohio judge to the effect that that was illegal.

My position on this matter is that if that kind of a procedure is to be encouraged, and encouraged from the bench, it is striking at the foundation of our Government. Here, furthermore, we have the spectacle of a judge sitting upon the bench and at the same time acting as the chief baseball arbitrator in the United States. It is said that he draws a salary in that capacity of \$42,000 a year. I am not complaining of his drawing that salary. I believe I noticed in the paper on Saturday that the Attorney General ruled that there was no law to prevent a United States judge from engaging in business; but, Mr. President, if there is no direct law to prevent it, certainly it never was expected that one holding that high and exalted position would engage in business.

In Judge Landis's case the papers to-day state that there are 1,230 cases upon his docket for trial; and that it will take at least two years to get rid of them. Now, we all know that if his mind is on baseball he can not properly perform the duties of his office as judge. It is beneath the dignity of the court, and it brings the court into disrepute, for a judge to accept a position of that kind. I have no harsh criticism to make of the sport of baseball. While I know very little about the game, yet it is an innocent sport, and one perhaps to be engaged in in a moderate way. I have not a very high regard for this professional baseball, but it is the business of a judge to stay in the courthouse and to attend to the business for which he was appointed.

I stated on Saturday that I proposed to bring the matter to the attention of some friends in the House and see if we could not prefer charges against Judge Landis and impeach him, and that is the course I expect to pursue. He shows by his reply to me that he is not constituted by temperament to exercise the duties of a judge. He goes on and undertakes to abuse me. I shall not answer him in kind, and belittle myself and lower the dignity of the Senate by bandying epithets with a self-advertised crank and a freak like him. His statements in regard to my position in South Carolina are without truth in the main. They show that he has not studied the question and that he handles facts very loosely. He tries to abuse the people of South Carolina for allowing children to work in cotton mills; but I do not propose to be sidetracked by any argument on that point, though what he says on that subject is totally out of line with the facts. Furthermore, he tries to attract attention to himself by saying that a few years ago he was instrumental in having a child-labor law passed through Congress, or words to that effect, and later the Supreme Court of the United States held this law to be unconstitutional, and he accused one of the mills with which I am connected with having that law upset. That is far from the fact. Nothing of that sort is true. A suit was brought to test the constitutionality of that act, but it was brought by a citizen of another State, and not a citizen of South Carolina; but the people who brought that action are not to be criticized, because any man in this country has a right to test the constitutionality of any law.

Furthermore, the people of South Carolina do not seek, need, or relish any advice from a spectacular judge in Chicago as to how they should run their own business.

Judge Landis goes on further and speaks of my possessions in South Carolina. It is not very polite for one to parade his poverty or his riches; but I will say that any such demagoguery, trying to bring ridicule upon a person because he has labored hard and tried to accumulate something of this world's goods, is unworthy of a man who sits on the bench, or any other man. If it will do the idle curious any good—if there be any idle curious—I will state that my personal means are small. I have accumulated a little of this world's goods, and I live within my income, and I am able to meet my obligations. Judge

Landis's statements about my great possessions are absolutely untrue. I only wish I had more. I might state further that any man who does not try to better his condition in life, to better the condition of his family, and to lay up something for their comfort, is unworthy to have a family. I take no stock in any such dirty demagoguery.

Mr. President, I do not suppose it will interest the Senate very much, but it may do some good to some of the young people of the country to let them know that everybody in this country is not a Shylock. This judge refers to me as being president of a trust company and a bank in my town, but it may surprise him to know that I organized that trust company some 10 or 12 years ago, and we have made a moderate and modest success out of it. I organized it for the purpose of building up my section and of helping worthy enterprises, and I have never drawn a nickel of salary out of it. That may be astonishing to Landis. I organized a bank, of which I am still president, to which he refers in the morning paper, a small institution. We have made a success out of that bank. From the time it was organized until the present hour I have never drawn out of that bank as much salary in any month as this young boy was drawing. That may astonish Judge Landis. I do not want to be misunderstood, however, because I have other occupations; but I want it to go out to the country that there are some people who can work, and who work for love, to help build up their sections, and they are not always trying to grab money, money, money for themselves, but there are some people who have higher ideals in life; and I hope that that principle will spread out over the country and will stop any such demagoguery as that promulgated by this crank.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. DIAL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator should keep in mind the old Biblical warning:

Jest not with a rude man, lest thy ancestors be disgraced.

Mr. DIAL. I am not so very well versed in that scripture; but I am glad the Senator has called it to my attention.

Mr. President, the point I am complaining about in this judge's ruling, and one reason I brought it to the attention of the Senate is that if that goes unchallenged there is a judicial invitation to every employee in the United States, to every bank clerk, to every person who handles other people's money and goods, if he is not satisfied with the salary which he is receiving to take what he wants. It provides judicial immunity from punishment to anyone who does not think he gets enough and takes what belongs to another. That is the most bolshevistic doctrine I ever heard enunciated in my life, and I say that any man who entertains those sentiments is not worthy to sit upon any bench in any country.

Mr. President, in this particular case that boy did not steal \$50, or \$100, or some other amount that he may have needed to help support himself and his family (I believe it is claimed he had a family), but he embezzled \$96,000 of that bank's money. Therefore this judge put a premium, as it were, upon the amount of his thievery. I am sorry for the boy. This judge was not trying to do so much good and show so much sympathy in his heart. If so, he would not have made the matter public, but would have closed the doors and talked the matter over with the boy and the directors of the bank. But he had to go up on the housetop and sound his own trumpet and try to play his spectacular antics, as he has heretofore been accustomed to do. He cared nothing about the name of the boy, just so he could be held up to the world as a great friend of the poor man, that tummyrot we have heard so much about. There would have been some excuse, perhaps, if that were true; but even that would not have justified what he said.

It is not with the court to say whether the compensation of any man is adequate. I venture to say, Mr. President, leaving out New England and the East, the North and the Middle West, not one-half of the clerks in the banks of the United States draw as much as \$90 per month.

But I am not to be diverted from the main issue by getting into the question of a proper wage. This freak does not content himself with rendering his decision in the courthouse, but he hikes off on the highways, and goes off somewhere to speak to the American Legion, and undertakes to turn loose his venom, his misrepresentation, and his falsehood upon me, and I believe that he did it willfully, because the statements are founded on things he could easily have verified.

It is said, Mr. President, that he was applauded by the American Legion. I believe that is a vile slander upon the American Legion. I have no idea that any soldier who ever donned the uniform and fought for his country, or was ready to fight for

his country, would applaud the sentiment of embezzlement. If they did, God pity them. In this time of unrest, when there is so much lawlessness going over the country, it behooves all good American citizens, and especially the men on the bench, to preach sound doctrine and honest principle.

Mr. President, I am about through. I have had this matter up with friends in the House. I do not know whether these charges are sufficient to impeach this man or not. But I am having them investigated thoroughly. I am going to call the attention of the Department of Justice to it, to see whether or not the highest law officials of this country would approve any such sentiment. If they go unrebuked, then there is an example set whereby the unwary, whereby the inexperienced, may commit theft and embezzlement, and whereby, as I said before, the very foundations of our society will be endangered.

I have already received a telegram from some crank trying to make a hero out of that boy. So all such doctrine should be blotted out at the earliest possible moment.

I say Judge Landis is incapacitated by training and by his sentiments. His statement shows he is unsound in principle. Perhaps I will introduce a bill in the Senate in a few days to make it illegal for a judge to receive any other salary than that he receives as a judge. If there is anything in this country we are proud of it is our judiciary, and I hope we will continue to hold it in the esteem to which it is entitled. We have always held it in high esteem, even during the troublous times of the Civil War and thereafter. No one ever criticized the United States Supreme Court. It is entitled to the respect and the confidence of everybody, and I feel that if we are going to have this kind of freak on the bench the sentiments of the people will soon change.

Mr. President, those are the reasons I had for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. We may not be directly interested, but all the people, all law-loving people, all people who favor order and favor justice, and all people who want to sow the seed of decency and of right in this country, are interested in the principle. We talk of trying to educate the foreigners and get them to become initiated into our habits and manners and thoughts, but we can not do that as long as anybody can point to such statements as those made by this judge and they are allowed to go unrebuked.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. GAY addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. SMOOT. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HARRISON. I was merely asking the Senator from Louisiana whether or not any of the sugar that was produced in Louisiana is now in the hands of producers and what per cent is in the hands of the refiners, and I then inquired about Utah and the beet-sugar industry generally—whether it is now in the hands of producers or in the hands of refiners?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I received a statement yesterday showing that the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. has made—this year's run—2,300,000 bags of sugar, and out of the 2,300,000 bags they had sold 274,000 bags. So they had on hand all of the sugar produced by them, with the exception of 274,000 bags, which has been sold.

Mr. HARRISON. What percentage of the sugar produced in Utah is made by that concern?

Mr. SMOOT. The Utah-Idaho Sugar Co., of course, takes in a number of plants in Utah and in Idaho, one in Washington, one in Oregon, and one in Nevada, although I do not think the Nevada plant makes very much sugar. So it would only be a guess on my part to say what percentage of the production of the State of Utah they make; but I can state about what percentage of the sugar they produce in Idaho, Nevada, and Utah. I should say that they produce at least 57 or 58 per cent of the beet sugar manufactured in the States named.

Mr. HARRISON. That amount is produced by that company?

Mr. SMOOT. That is produced by that company.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, I imagine, they also buy from producers?

Mr. SMOOT. No; they do not buy from other producers; they do not buy any sugar at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Is that concern affiliated with the American Sugar Refining Co.?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it an independent concern?

Mr. SMOOT. Years ago Mr. Havemeyer owned 51 per cent of the Utah Sugar Co. After the consolidation came about be-

tween the sugar companies of Idaho and the sugar companies of Utah, Mr. Havemeyer sold his interest in them to Mr. C. W. Nibley, and he, in turn, sold a portion of the stock to others, considerable of it going to beet growers.

Mr. HARRISON. The small producers have already disposed of their crops, have they not?

Mr. SMOOT. They have. The beet farmers had contracts with the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. and other sugar companies, under which the companies paid them \$12 a ton for every ton of beets which they grew; in fact, all the sugar companies, the Amalgamated, the Gunnison Valley, and the West Cache, had contracts with the farmers to pay a minimum price of \$12 a ton for the beets. At \$12 a ton for beets they can make sugar for \$9.54 a hundred pounds—that is, the Utah-Idaho Co., and they make it cheaper than the smaller companies—and they are selling that sugar to-day, that cost the Utah-Idaho Co. \$9.54 a hundred pounds, made from the beets for which they paid the farmer \$12, for less than 7 cents net a pound. That is the condition of the sugar companies in Utah.

Mr. HARRISON. The farmers have already sold their beets?

Mr. SMOOT. They have sold all of their beets, and they received \$12 a ton for them.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. So that, as a matter of fact, the proposed tariff on sugar would not help the beet farmer in the West in connection with his last crop at all, would it?

Mr. SMOOT. No; but it will help the farmers because of other conditions which exist, for it must be borne in mind that because of the contracts which they made some of the sugar plants will fail. So it will help the farmers in the future if that situation can be obviated—

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but it would not help the farmers at all who raised sugar beets last year?

Mr. SMOOT. No; not for this year's crop; because they have received their money for this year's crop.

Mr. HARRISON. And, of course, during the summer it is hoped to enact the other tariff bill, and when it shall have passed Congress it will repeal the pending measure, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that contracts are generally made for the season with the farmers; those contracts ought to be signed at least by the 1st day of March, and, in fact, I think generally it is about the middle of February when the contracts are signed.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator think that this legislation, putting a tariff on sugar, would affect the farmers in getting a better contract?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no doubt about it—that is, for the coming year.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that the Senator means for the next year. They would assume, I imagine, that if this Congress put on this tariff on sugar at this time the incoming Congress would do likewise, and make as good a contract for them. Is that the idea?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know that they would assume that it would be exactly the same, but I think they would assume that there is going to be an increase in the rate of duty on sugar.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I desire to ask the Senator from Utah a question.

Mr. GAY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wanted to ask the Senator this question: The Senator says the farmers have already made their contracts. He says that they usually make them from the 15th of February to the 1st of March. Now, in view of the fact that it probably will be the 1st of March before this bill becomes a law, if it should become a law, will not the farmers already have made their contracts for another year?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think they would make a contract based on the price of sugar to-day. I should advise every farmer in Utah not to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not know whether they have done it or not, although this is the usual time?

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure they have not. In fact, if the farmers in Utah should ask me the question now whether or not they should make contracts on a 7-cent basis for sugar, I would tell them "no."

Mr. McKELLAR. I was thinking that if they had made their contracts by the 15th of February this year, the bill could not possibly help them for another year.

Mr. SMOOT. They have not made them, and I will say that they are not going to make them, either, based on the price of sugar to-day.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President—

Mr. GAY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator from Louisiana has stated that he believes that the Louisiana producers of sugar have suffered perhaps worse than the producers of beet sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GAY. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Idaho just asked me on what basis the contracts were made for beets.

I want to say to the Senator that the contracts for beets this year were on the basis of a minimum price of \$12, and for every dollar that sugar advanced over \$12 the farmer in my State was to get \$1 more a ton for his beets. In other words, if sugar had remained at \$20, then the farmer would have gotten \$20 a ton for his beets. If it had fallen to \$15, he would have gotten \$15 for his beets; but the minimum price for the beets was to be \$12 a ton.

Mr. RANSDELL. That was the result of a contract, was it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. I stated what the contract really was.

Mr. RANSDELL. Of course, the contract for the crop to be made this year will naturally be based upon the expected price they are to get this year.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, if they make a contract; but, if I were a farmer, I would not make a contract for beets with sugar at 7 cents a pound.

Mr. RANSDELL. I think the Senator's advice to the farmers in that respect would be very good. May I ask this, because I did not get it quite clearly: The Senator stated that the farmers who produced beets had received from the refineries this good price of \$12 a ton. I will ask the Senator if quite large quantities of beets are not produced by the beet-refining companies themselves, for their own refineries?

Mr. SMOOT. Not in our section of the country.

Mr. RANSDELL. Practically all of the beets are raised by independent farmers?

Mr. SMOOT. By independent farmers.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only that; but most of the beets are raised by farmers that have not over 5 acres of land. The cultivation of beets requires the best land, irrigated land, and it requires very, very intensive cultivation, and that work is done generally by the farmer himself and his children, although there are some farmers that have 20 or 30 acres; and in that case they have to hire help.

Mr. RANSDELL. Then the farmers themselves have received a price which gave them a fair remuneration, possibly?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, there is no doubt about it so far as the beet raiser is concerned.

Mr. RANSDELL. But the drop in sugar has hit the refineries very, very hard, I take it.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, if some of them pull through they will be very fortunate. I know one little sugar company in the northern part of my State that contracted for its entire output at 14 cents a pound to a wholesale concern on the Missouri River, at Omaha, Nebr. The wholesalers paid the company an advance of \$500,000 on the output of that little factory. Those wholesalers gave the company the \$500,000 rather than carry out the contract. They lost \$500,000, and that is about the only little company we have in the State that is to-day in a fair condition.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will not the Senator tell us in a general way, please, who constitute the various refineries that handle this beet sugar? Are they not American citizens, and quite a large number of American citizens?

Mr. SMOOT. In our State, and in fact throughout the West, there is not a sugar factory in which the farmers themselves do not own stock and the stockholders are all Americans.

Mr. RANSDELL. I was trying to get that very point. Are not these refineries really owned by the farming classes of people to a very great extent?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. Of course I will not say that they own a controlling interest, but I do know that there are thousands and thousands of stockholders in the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co., and I do know that a great many of those are farmers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GAY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I just want to ask the Senator from Utah, on what basis is \$12-a-ton sugar? About how much is that a pound? How is that figured per pound of refined sugar?

Mr. SMOOT. The Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. is the largest company in the intermountain States, with the exception of the Western Sugar Co., of Denver, Colo. That company makes sugar a little cheaper than the Utah-Idaho Co. does. Twelve dollars a ton for beets means that the Utah-Idaho Co. makes sugar at \$9.54 a hundred.

Mr. McKELLAR. Nine and fifty-four one-hundredths cents per pound.

Mr. GAY resumed his speech. After having spoken for a few minutes,

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I feel that I owe the Senator from Louisiana an apology, because I want to ask a question of the Senator from Utah, with whom I have just had a colloquy. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] asked the Senator from Utah if the sugar companies in his part of the country were not controlled largely by farmers, and the Senator afterwards spoke of the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. Now, let me ask the Senator if the majority of the stock of the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. is not in the hands of what we commonly know as the Sugar Trust, the American Sugar Refining Co.?

Mr. SMOOT. The American Sugar Refining Co. does not own one dollar of the stock.

Mr. McKELLAR. Who controls it?

Mr. SMOOT. C. W. Nibley is the largest stockholder. I do not think he owns the controlling interest, but he purchased all the stock that was owned by Mr. Havemeyer when Mr. Havemeyer did own the controlling interest in the company, but in that purchase a great many people in Utah took a part of the stock. In fact, it was offered to anybody at the price Nibley paid for it, but I can not say how much of that stock was purchased by the different individuals and the farmers throughout the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator understand that 51 per cent of the stock of the Utah-Idaho Co. is controlled by the Sugar Trust?

Mr. SMOOT. Why does the Senator ask me that question when I tell him that it is not true and that they do not own a dollar of it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Sugar Trust does not own a dollar of it?

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I have said two or three times.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I have been misinformed.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has been misinformed if anybody ever has made such a statement to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why did they dispose of it?

Mr. SMOOT. It was at a time when sugar was very low, and a change of administration occurred, and they thought, of course, that sugar was going down, and they decided to sell it; that is all.

Mr. McKELLAR. So now they have no interest in that company?

Mr. SMOOT. They have no interest in the company at all.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate is one designed to relieve the distress and deplorable condition existing throughout the agricultural sections of this country. It is hardly fair to call this measure a tariff measure. It should be entitled emergency legislation for the relief of those engaged in all agricultural pursuits. The consideration of this measure should be entirely nonpartisan and nonpolitical. I have been surprised that Senators should attempt to make political capital out of the measure designed to give relief to the farmers of this country whose distressing condition is directly due to the havoc wrought by the Great War, and to the fact that this country has not yet returned to a peace basis and normal condition.

We are still going through a part of the war period, and it is not the proper time to take up partisan measures such as the tariff, nor to consider the pending bill from the standpoint of whether you believe in protective principles of government or free trade.

During the war extraordinary powers were vested in commissions. Powers were delegated to individuals the like of which had never been known before in our history. Economic rules were set aside and the law of supply and demand was not considered. Our economic forces, the wealth as well as the manhood of our Nation, were mobilized for the great task which was before us, a task which was wonderfully performed in a remarkably short period of time—the preservation of our civilization.

The appeal that went forward from the Food Administration to all loyal Americans was to produce maximum crops. One of the most vital necessities in the way of food was to increase production of sugar. The supply for our own people was cut to a minimum amount, and patriotic Americans everywhere consumed just as little sugar as they possibly could, in order that it might be sent to our troops abroad and to our allies. The acreage in both cane and beet cultivation was greatly increased, and with the diminishing supply of labor it was remarkable that such crops as were produced could be harvested.

The price of sugar was fixed by the Food Administration at what was thought by Mr. Hoover and his associates to be a fair return, and yet at a price that would give the American people comparatively cheap sugar. It is a matter of record that during the war the price of sugar in the United States was lower than any other country in the world. This price in many

instances worked hardship on the American producer, but there were and are no more patriotic class of people in America than the American farmer, and few if any complaints were raised against the rulings made by the Food Administration during the war period. The reaction that has come is but natural and is similar to that which has come after all periods of war.

Deflation is necessary, but to attempt to deflate war prices overnight threatens those in all lines of agricultural productions. It is impossible and unreasonable to expect prewar prices to come so shortly after a war of such magnitude, and this legislation is designed as a temporary relief, a fixed period of time being named in the bill of 10 months, to meet post-war conditions.

We have seen suggested in the press that should this emergency legislation fall the next Congress, which is to be called in extra session soon after the new administration comes into power, would quickly pass the Dingley bill, or the Payne-Aldrich schedule, to give the relief the farmers and producers of America so badly need due entirely to the economic conditions brought about by the war.

Any legislation attempted hurriedly is necessarily more or less imperfect, and some injustice, in all likelihood, will be done. But let not the representatives of the American people fail to perform the duty which they owe to that class which never have received from the hands of the American Congress the justice to which they are entitled.

Mr. President, I contend that the schedule of the Payne-Aldrich bill and the Dingley bill do not fit the present situation. These great tariff measures were enacted after careful deliberation and for the purpose of fitting conditions that existed at the time they were passed. Neither of these measures would be suitable now, and it is essential that speedy relief be given by a measure designed, as this one has been, to meet the existing emergency. The new Congress will, of course, frame a tariff bill. Already hearings are being held on the different schedules and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House will be in a position to frame a tariff that will meet post-war conditions just as were those tariffs in the past framed to meet the conditions of the times. But the farmers of this country, those who produce our food and great staple crops, can not wait until July, August, or even perhaps the fall of this year for the new legislation. It will be too late in many instances to give the relief sought. The doctor is needed now, and his services will not be required if the patient is allowed to linger.

I say, from first-hand information, regardless of the statements that have been made on the floor of the Senate, that the sugar producers of America need at once a duty on sugar to tide them over and through the most disastrous period in the history of American production.

The amendment which I introduced is intended to give that relief. It is intended to raise the present duty three times the amount of that specified in the Simmons-Underwood bill. It is limited to a period of 10 months. It has a provision whereby the American consumer is protected against paying an excessive price for his sugar. I know of no other measure before Congress which limits the operation of a tariff as does this one now under consideration. It provides—

That if the imposition of the duties herein shall have the effect of increasing the price in the ports of the United States of duty-paid 96° centrifugal sugar produced in and imported from Cuba beyond 8 cents per pound, or shall increase the price in the ports of the United States of similar sugars paying full duty beyond 8.75 cents per pound, or shall increase the price in the ports of the United States of sugars that have gone through a process of refining, or sugars fit for direct human consumption, beyond 10 cents per pound, then the emergency duty herein named shall be automatically decreased so as to prevent the prices of such sugars advancing beyond the respective prices herein named.

Mr. President, the price of sugar to-day in New York has been forced down by the refining interests of this country to a point where they know full well they will be deprived of American competition and which will wipe out entirely the producers of sugar in continental United States. They do not relish the idea that men can engage in a farming enterprise in this country and manufacture in a small way a table commodity, such as is the pure sugar produced in both the beet and cane sugar factories, which will come in competition, which they feel they are privileged by a great combination of capital to bring from foreign countries and run through their refining processes at enormous profits and serve to the American public. They are absolutely bold in their statements that they would like to see producers of sugar in the United States completely wiped off the map. And you gentlemen who are advocating a low duty on the greatest revenue-producing article which the United States Government has are playing into the hands of American refiners who produce nothing; who do not help the farmers in any way, but who simply buy their sugar from foreign countries, where it is produced at a low scale of wages, bring it to our seaboard, and pass it through their laundering machines.

What, Mr. President, was their position before they had the American product to compete with? They got anywhere from 3 to 5 cents a pound for refining in the United States. Why? Simply because there was no domestic sugar produced in the United States except a small quantity of plantation clarified sugar produced in Louisiana, and they had no competition.

We find at that time, in 1871, at the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee, having under consideration the revision of the tariff, these refiners through their representatives, insisting upon a tariff—a greater tariff—not only a tariff based upon the polariscopic test but also upon a color test, in order to prevent foreign refined sugar from coming in competition with their product. These very tariffs that were then being insisted upon by the refiners had the effect of stimulating the domestic industry at home. The Louisiana industry thrived, and the beet industry was planted in the West and began to grow. Direct consumption sugar was produced from the manufacture of sugar beets, was placed upon the market and sold in direct competition with the refiners' standard granulated sugar, and sold at a lower price.

What effect did this have upon the refined product? The price was reduced. Not that the raw sugar in the United States cost less money, but the refiners' margin, which, as before stated, was from 3 to 5 cents per pound, began to be reduced. A sugar refinery was established in New Orleans, State of Louisiana, and sold sugar in direct competition with the Louisiana plantation clarified sugars. This margin between raws and refined continued to be reduced by the refiner until at last we see it reach the low level in New Orleans of 60 cents per hundred pounds. In other words, the refiner would purchase raw sugar, refine it, and put the refined on the market at 60 cents a hundred. To-day he gets \$2.25 per hundred pounds.

The effect of that reduction was to break down the competition of the direct consumption sugar in Louisiana. The man who produced yellow clarified sugar and sold it to the trade could better afford to put it into raw sugar and sell it for 60 cents less per hundred pounds than to put it in the direct consumption sugar.

So, in a few years there was scarcely any sugar produced in Louisiana other than raw sugar, and the refiners had the market. But the beet-sugar industry having been fostered and protected by tariff, increased about 1,400 per cent in 10 years, and it put its product upon the market and sold it, and it sold at about 20 cents per hundred pounds under the price of refined. The sugar refiners protested loud and lustily that beet sugar was inferior to cane, that it could not be used for a number of purposes for which cane sugar could be used. But the public at last learned the true cause of this great interest manifested in their behalf by the refiners to prevent them from buying this inferior sugar, and found that the sugar was just as sweet and pretty as cane refined sugar, and its use kept pace with the increased production. The producers pressed its sale upon the market at prices from 10 to 20 cents per hundred pounds less than the cane sugar was being sold for, and the result was the continued decrease in the price of cane refined sugar in order to meet the competition. This process continued until the American people got the cheapest sugar of almost any people upon the face of the earth.

Suppose wise statesmanship of America had not aided the beet industry? Suppose instead they had destroyed the industry in Louisiana, and the only source of supply had been the refiners? Do you believe that they would have reduced the cost of refining from \$5 to 60 cents per hundred pounds, thereby reducing the price of sugar? Remove the tariff, or reduce it to the point of making it inadequate to protect the industry, and make this great American public solely dependent upon the American refiner for his supply of sugar, and in a short while he will find that he not only pays more for his sugar than before, but that his Government derives no revenue therefrom.

This is not only a question affecting the present but the future of this great industry in the United States and its ultimate success as one of the great agricultural products of the United States. If the industry continues to increase in the future as it has in the past, if the new methods of manufacture and increased production from a ton of beets continues for the next 25 years as it has for the past 20, it may be possible for the sugar produced in the United States to compete with the sugar of the world. If so, and we then produce not only sugar sufficient to furnish continental United States but other lands, necessarily there would be no tariff, or a tariff would be ineffective and the price would be absolutely controlled by the law of supply and demand. In other words, sugar in the United States would occupy the same position as does corn, wheat, and cotton.

With this magnificent prospect for the future of the sugar industry, how is it possible for any statesman to feel that it is his duty to support a measure that would cripple or destroy the

industry? And please remember that if there had never been a tariff imposed on sugar there likely would never have been a beet factory erected in the United States. So, gentlemen, I hope you will take with a grain of salt the argument used by these refiners. It is to their interest to cripple or destroy the production of sugar in the United States, thereby destroying competition.

Mr. President, to illustrate, years ago each and every farmer raised a few hogs, killed them, cured the meat in his own smokehouse, and any surplus was carried to town, sold to the store, and distributed to the nonproducer. In those years every little farmer in the United States was a miniature packing house. The meat packers of the Nation, being alive to this competition, began to reduce the cost of packing; that is, the price between the hog standing and the hog slaughtered, packed, and ready for shipment. This reduction in the cost of packing continued until in 1895 and 1896, if my recollection is correct, dried salt shoulders were sold at about 4 cents wholesale, while the hog standing was worth from 2½ to 3½ cents per pound. In other words, there was less than a dollar per hundred pounds difference between the hog standing and the hog packed—that is, dry salt shoulders; at that time hams and breakfast bacon were worth about 7 to 7½ cents per pound. The result was that the farmer found it cheaper to sell his hogs and buy back his requirement of meat than it was to take the risk of slaughtering his hogs and curing his own meat. This process went on until all the smokehouses of the Nation were closed, most of them destroyed, and each farmer sold his hogs and bought back his meat, and then it was that the differential between the hog standing and the hog packed began to increase. What is it to-day? Examine the quotations. I dare say the packers to-day are getting more for packing the hog than both he and the hog grower got in 1895 and 1896.

This fully illustrates the point. When the packer had competition, the cost of packing was reduced to the minimum, thereby reducing the price of the commodity. With competition destroyed, the cost of packing has increased and materially increased the cost of the product.

In 1871 refined sugar in the United States was sold to the consumer at the original cost of the raws plus about 5 cents per pound for refining. A wise Government stimulated the production of sugar in the United States, which was sold in direct competition with this refined article, and the cost of refining was reduced from 5 cents per pound to less than 1 cent per pound. At the same time the price of sugar was decreased, although a tariff was being maintained. In the 10 years prior to 1913 everything that went into human consumption increased in price from 10 to 60 per cent except sugar and raisins. Sugar decreased about 10 per cent and raisins, I think, about 15 per cent. This fact should be taken into consideration in determining the question of what would be a fair tariff to impose upon this commodity for the purpose of taking care of the domestic industry considered relatively with other farm products. I tell you, gentlemen, the domestic industry is worth saving.

The Louisiana sugar producer is primarily an agriculturist; his final product, sugar, measured by the greatest element of cost in its production is an agricultural product. More than 50 per cent of the cost is in the culture and bringing to maturity of the cane. It takes 12 months' preparation and culture to bring the raw material, cane, to the point of conversion into sugar. All the risks of drought, floods, insects, disease, labor shortage—in fact, all the risks that any agriculturist must take and can not provide against in advance—must be met by the Louisiana sugar producer. The Louisiana manufacturer, so called, of sugar is also the grower of cane, as shown by the following table:

Cane, \$10.		Per cent.
Factory grown	44.82
Purchased or grown by tenants	54.66
Ground on toll52
Total	100.00

Unlike the manufacturer who can from day to day reduce or entirely eliminate losses by ceasing to purchase raw product, or shut down his plant, or increase his profits from day to day by judicious purchases, always protected and guarded, able to change or adjust his plans in a single day, the Louisiana producer-manufacturer of cane and cane sugar must grind the cane as it comes, good or bad, and then must convert the field product, cane, into the finished product, sugar, without regard to loss or profit. In this he should be encouraged, by protecting him in some small degree against the competition of cheap foreign labor and low living conditions.

The Louisiana producer-manufacturer is entitled to the same degree of consideration as the maker of the machinery he used in his factory, the plows and implements, tractors, wagons, and railroad equipment used in factory and field, the clothing he wears; he should receive the same consideration at the hands

of his Government as any other American citizen engaged in legitimate productive enterprise. He asks for no more; he should not expect less.

It has been asked if other crops could not be raised on the rich soils of the Louisiana cane area. The answer is the question, Why discontinue growing a product needed in every home, a product that is an absolute necessity for the human and national welfare, a crop the production of which distributes 95 per cent of its income to labor, and other products, both natural and manufactured, in America—a product which needs to be doubled to supply the demands of America? For every acre now planted in cane in Louisiana just that much less competition is there with the producer of other American crops. Of the 52,298,000 bushels of rice grown in 1920 in America 24,640,000 bushels were produced in Louisiana. Rice could be grown on much of the cane land, but why increase the production and competition in rice when to-day the rice grower is producing at a loss? Why add to a cotton crop that right now it seems can only be saved from bankruptcy by reducing and not increasing the acreage—and so with other crops?

Sugar production should receive more encouragement in America than any other crop. Sugar production should be encouraged until America stood independent of every foreign land in its sugar supply.

Another reason why a change should not be made to other crops is that sugar growing and making is more highly developed and requires greater skill in its production than any other crop produced in America. The Louisiana sugar producer has devoted his life to the study of this specialty; in most instances his ancestors for several generations preceding have been sugar specialists. He knows no other crop. All his capital is invested in specially devised equipment for the planting and culture of sugar cane. Millions of dollars are represented in his sugar houses. All his lands are platted, drained, and laid out for the production of sugar. A change to other crops would require a complete change, a casting aside—in fact, a virtual abandonment and sacrifice of practically all his property. Any man who will give consideration to the thought will abandon such a suggestion. The Louisiana sugar producer—manufacturer, or cane grower alone, is a specialist. He has done much for the world in developing the production of cane sugar. A major portion of the improved methods of cane and sugar production throughout the world had their origin in and were developed by Louisiana and the Louisiana sugar producer—manufacturer. Men trained in the Louisiana fields and her sugar school have gone to all cane-sugar sections of the world, to there live in the development of the industry as superintendents and managers and directors of sugar-experiment stations.

The reasonable price of sugar to the consumer is due to Louisiana development more than to any other one cause. Louisiana is ready to go forward to greater production, larger development, further advance in sugar production; but to do so she must have reasonable assurance of stability, and nothing can do more to accomplish this than a reasonable measure of tariff protection, such as she asks for and expects that the Congress of the United States in its wisdom will see fit to approve and fix.

Mr. President, I have read a portion of the statement which was presented to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House by representatives of the American Cane Growers' Association. I desire now to give the Senate the benefit of a statement made by Mr. Milling, who appeared before the Committee on Finance at the time that committee had under consideration the emergency tariff bill. I quote from the statement of Mr. Milling. In presenting the argument he stated that the question of an emergency tariff should be considered from three points of view:

"First, Are the market conditions of sugar such as to justify the imposition of the tariff? Second, Would the tariff be fair to the consuming public? Third, Would such tariff yield substantial revenues to the Nation? * * *

To answer this question, that is, the question with regard to market conditions of sugar, and whether or not they justified the imposition of a tariff, Mr. Milling said:

"It will be necessary to take into consideration the market price of that commodity at the time of planting and cultivating the present crop, and the costs incurred in producing same. When the 1920 crop was planted, and during the whole time it was growing, all costs of production had reached the maximum, which was the highest, perhaps, known in the history of the United States. In order to successfully grow a sugar crop it is necessary that there be rapid and thorough cultivation, liberal application of fertilizers, and the purchase of all things necessary to promptly and efficiently operate a large plantation. Those costs in 1920 were three times their cost prior to the breaking out of the World War.

"For example, the cane producers of Louisiana paid \$65 to \$85 per ton for fertilizers, which prior to the war cost from \$18 to \$25. They paid \$6.25 to \$6.50 per bushel for cowpeas, which are used at the rate of 1½ bushels per acre in sowing one-third of the plantation, to be plowed under the following fall as a fertilizer. These peas prior to the war cost \$1 to \$2 per bushel. They paid for the necessary mules upon the plantation from \$350 to \$450 per mule, whereas prior to the war such mules cost from \$150 to \$225 each. They paid from double to treble the price for plows, gear, implements, and all kinds of wagons and machinery of every description. They paid a heavy increase in freight rates in transporting all of these commodities to the plantation.

"These costs being enormous, nothing short of a full crop and a price based upon production costs—in fact, a price of from 15 to 18 cents per pound—would have brought the sugar producers out without a loss. But instead of having a full crop they harvested hardly a half crop, and instead of the price being from 15 to 18 cents it is less than half that amount."

The price of every commodity, I will say, that is used by the producer of cane sugar in Louisiana is three or four times higher than before the war. Mr. Milling further stated:

"We have faced floods from the Mississippi River; early freezes; seen the crops of whole plantations destroyed by these disasters; but never in the history of the industry has it been in the condition that it is to-day."

Mr. President, I could go on at great length and cite the situation that exists in Louisiana, and, in fact, throughout the entire agricultural section of the United States. The conditions in Louisiana are on a par with the conditions in other sections, but I really believe that that section has been hit a little harder even than the wheat-growing portion of the country or the portions of the country where sugar beets are produced. They have had to contend with various kinds of misfortune; their crops have cost them more than ever before in the history of the country; and, furthermore, their crops were harvested and put upon the market at a time when there was absolutely no demand for sugar. I may add that the same condition prevails to-day.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GAY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. The sugar crop of Louisiana has already been harvested, has it not?

Mr. GAY. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it now in the hands of the producers or the refiners?

Mr. GAY. It is in the hands, very largely, of the producers.

Mr. HARRISON. What per cent is in the hands of the American Sugar Refining Co., if I get the name correctly?

Mr. GAY. I think there is a very small percentage in the hands of the American Sugar Refining Co., for the reason that the producers in Louisiana are now making a table sugar themselves that is suitable for direct consumption. They do not have to depend on the American Sugar Refining Co. as they had to depend on them in the past. Therefore a very small percentage of their product, I should say, is in the hands of the American Sugar Refining Co. I have not the figures here with regard to the exact amount.

Mr. HARRISON. But all the cane has been cut and the sugar has already been made in Louisiana?

Mr. GAY. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. Is that true of the beet-sugar crop in Utah?

Mr. GAY. I must say that I am not prepared to answer exactly as to what the conditions are in Utah; the Senator from Utah probably can give that information better than I can. I will be glad if the Senator from Utah will give us his attention for a moment, as probably he can answer the question of the Senator from Mississippi.

[At this point Mr. GAY yielded further to Mr. HARRISON, and a colloquy ensued between Mr. HARRISON, Mr. SMOOT, and other Senators.]

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I shall now proceed with the question I was about to ask of my colleague. He stated, in substance, that the Louisiana sugar growers had lost very heavily. I will ask him if he will not elaborate that statement a little bit and show, if it be true, that not only was the crop of 1920 in Louisiana almost a failure, but the crops of 1919 and 1918 were also very, very poor crops, occasioned by climatic conditions and other things, and if they were not unremunerative crops in spite of the high price at which sugar sold a year ago?

Mr. GAY. I will say to the Senator, in reply, that I have before me here the figures in regard to the crops that were produced in the State of Louisiana for the past three years, and that 1919 was even more disastrous, so far as the amount of sugar that was produced was concerned, than last year; but last year, owing to the fact that the crop was produced at the

very peak of the price of labor and of everything that enters into the cost of production, and then put upon the market at a time when sugar was selling for almost one-third of what it had sold for after the war, from the standpoint of revenue it was the most disastrous year in the history of the business, and that now the great question that confronts the people down there engaged in this highly developed style of agriculture is where they will be able to get money to go on for another year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. RANDELL. I hope the Senator will allow me to conclude this line of inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Montana in the chair). To whom does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. GAY. I yield to my colleague, and then I will yield to the Senator from Tennessee afterwards.

Mr. RANDELL. I understand very clearly what the Senator says now. His statement shows that the crop of 1920 was a very, very disastrous one to the sugar grower of Louisiana. I will ask him if the crop of 1919 was not also a very unremunerative crop, although the prices for the finished product were high on account of the very small yield of that year, 1919?

Mr. GAY. I will answer that by saying that in some sections of Louisiana, throughout the sugar belt, there was a profit made on the 1919 crop, but that throughout most of that section there were losses. I have not the percentage, but in some sections they were favored with better weather conditions, and they made a fair return on their investment.

Mr. RANDELL. How was it in 1918? Was not that an unremunerative crop also, in the main?

Mr. GAY. It was a better crop than the 1919 and 1920 crops.

Mr. RANDELL. But the prices were not high?

Mr. GAY. Not high.

Mr. RANDELL. So, then, to follow my question a little further, you have three unremunerative crops there—1918, 1919, and 1920—and the crop of 1920 was the most disastrous ever recorded in the history of the Louisiana sugar industry?

Mr. GAY. That is correct.

[At this point Mr. GAY yielded for a colloquy between Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. Smoot.]

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, a representative of the beet-sugar industry, Mr. W. L. Petrikin, representing the Great Western Sugar Co., of Denver, Colo., in appearing before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, made this statement:

"There is not any doubt, if the domestic industry was destroyed and they had it within their own hands"—

That is the subject I was discussing a few minutes ago, the question of the sugar refiners having control of the sugar industry, and the domestic sugar industry being wiped out—

"that sugar would cost the consumer more than it does at the present time. I do not think there is any doubt about that at all. I heard a question asked a while ago by one of the members of the committee that if the tariff were put on sugar would it increase the cost to the consumer. I think it would. I think it is also true that if there was no tariff, and there was no beet industry, you would still pay higher than when the increased tariff is put on."

I believe that statement to be absolutely correct.

I ask permission to insert several tables in connection with my remarks, particularly a table of the present tariffs on sugar in 14 different countries, showing the rates of tariff per pound in cents per pound.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cents per pound.		Cents per pound.	
Austria.....	2.39	Italy.....	2.00
Belgium.....	2.23	Japan.....	3.392
Canada.....	1.93	Netherlands.....	4.103
Czechoslovakia.....	2.276	Spain.....	5.25
Denmark.....	1.216	Sweden.....	1.216
France.....	6.128	United Kingdom.....	5.574
Germany.....	2.03		
Hungary.....	2.39		
		Average of the 14 countries.....	
		3.008	

"Notwithstanding the enormous amount of revenue which our sugar imports have yielded the Government during the past 50 years, the retail price of sugar has been lower in the United States than in most other countries. In 1911 the retail price of sugar in 20 leading foreign countries, as per figures gathered by our State Department, ranged from 5 cents per pound in Great Britain to 14 cents in Italy, as compared with 5.915 cents in New York City, as shown by the United States Department of Labor. In but 5 of these 20 foreign countries was the retail price of sugar lower than it was in New York City.

"Even during the war, when the price of sugar rose to unprecedented heights, the price of that commodity in the United States was lower than in almost all of the other leading countries of the world. In 1918 Mr. H. C. Prinsen Geerligs, of Amsterdam, one of the leading sugar statisticians of Europe,

published a statement showing the wholesale price of granulated sugar in March, 1918, in 12 of the leading European countries, as well as in the United States and Canada. The prices ranged from 5.71 cents per pound in Denmark to 19.7 cents in Italy. The average New York wholesale price at that time was 7.30 cents per pound, Copenhagen being the only other city listed in which sugar was cheaper than it was in New York."

Mr. GAY. The production of sugar cane for making sugar and sirup is by no means confined to the State of Louisiana. Louisiana does produce the major portion of the sugar from cane grown and produced in the United States, and whatever affects the cane grower and sugar producer in Louisiana is reflected in the other States producing sugar and sirup. The acreage in the several States growing sugar cane in 1920 was as follows: South Carolina, 8,200 acres; Georgia, 73,000 acres—let me say right here, Mr. President, that Georgia is one of the great cane-sirup producing States of the Union, and that that industry there is growing by leaps and bounds—Florida, 29,000 acres; Alabama, 72,600 acres; Mississippi, 33,100 acres; Louisiana, 299,100 acres; Texas, 15,400 acres; Arkansas, 3,100 acres; total, 533,500 acres.

Thus you will see that, of the cane planted in the United States for the production of sugar and sirup, Louisiana's acreage is only about 50 per cent of the total, and, being distributed, as it is, through eight of the Southern States, whatever affects one section will, of course, affect the whole.

While the above figures represent the actual acreage planted in 1920, and is a very material increase over that of 1919, which totaled for the eight States named 481,000 acres, yet it by no means represents the acreage suitable for the production of cane for sugar and molasses, nor does it represent the extent to which the industry could and would grow if given a reasonable protection. There is enough acreage in these eight States that could be brought under cane to relieve America of the necessity of importing the major portion of her sugar from foreign countries, and the need for this has been exemplified in a startling way during the year 1920, to say nothing of that period of the war when it looked as if America would have to go on short rations for sugar.

There was imported into the United States for the first 10 months of 1920, ending with the month of October, a total of 7,286,416,354 pounds of sugar; in the year 1919, 6,395,733,212 pounds, an excess in 1920 over 1919 of 890,683,142 pounds. In 1919 there was imported from the island of Cuba for the same 10-months period 6,086,395,865 pounds; in 1920, 5,429,750,203 pounds, showing a decrease in the importation from Cuba for the same 10-months period, 1919 and 1920, of 656,645,662 pounds. The total importation of sugar for the same 10-months period of 1919 was 6,395,733,212 pounds, and from Cuba 6,086,395,865 pounds, and from other countries 309,337,347 pounds; this for 1919 when prices were stable. In the 10 months, 1920, ending with October, the total import of sugar into the United States was 7,286,416,354 pounds, and from Cuba for the same period 5,429,750,203 pounds, giving a total from other countries of 1,856,661,151 pounds, or practically six times the volume of sugar brought from other countries in 1920 over that of the same period for 1919.

America has literally been flooded with high-priced sugars from countries not normally exporters to the United States. In many instances, undoubtedly, purchases of sugar have been made by foreign countries for speculation and dumped into the United States at the high price to which sugar was driven here by the manufacturers of nonessentials, profiteers, and speculators. This was possible because of the nominal tariff on sugar imported into the United States, even from full duty paying countries, and has resulted in all but ruining not only the producer of sugar on the American Continent but the Cuban sugar planter as well, Cuba being the normal source of supply for such sugars as it was necessary to import into the United States.

What is the condition to-day? The Louisiana producer finds himself confronted with this problem. He has grown and produced a crop of sugar at the highest price in the history of the industry. He has had to pay from two to three times the pre-war price for mules and other farm animals, for fertilizer, for corn, for cowpeas, tools, and other implements manufactured from steel and iron. He has had to pay the greatly increased freight rates. He has had to pay war prices for his labor, the top of the market for all of the articles that go into the growing of sugar cane and the manufacture of that article into table-consumption sugar, higher freight upon the cane and upon the product derived therefrom. It would have required a price for him to come out whole or break even on the result of the past season of from 12 to 15 cents a pound for sugar, a price which did not seem unreasonable at the time that he planted his crop and cultivated it. What has been the result? Sugar has fallen in price so rapidly and there is so little demand for it that he finds himself to-day confronted by the greatest crisis

that has ever been known, and many are face to face with bankruptcy. We have asked for a tariff in this great emergency to permit the producer to remain in business, and at the same time establishing a price low enough to be entirely fair to the consuming public. This increased duty would put the farmer in a position whereby he could receive advances to go on with the new crop and would help to stabilize the industry.

I do not feel that the amendment offered by Senator Smoot is sufficiently large to meet the present emergency, but I recognize, after having carefully canvassed the situation, that his amendment has more support in the Senate than the one which I have offered and which has been adopted by the committee. I have therefore decided not to press that amendment, and, believing that one-half of a loaf is better than no loaf at all, I have decided to support the Smoot amendment and sincerely hope it will be adopted by the Congress.

Mr. President, I do not regard the Smoot amendment as an emergency amendment, and I sincerely hope that when that amendment is agreed to it will become a permanent part of the tariff laws of the United States through the action of the next Congress.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, the so-called emergency tariff bill now before the Senate might well be entitled "An act to raise the high cost of living on the necessities of life."

Let us consider the commodities on which a tax is to be placed: Wheat, flour, corn, beans, peanuts, peanut oil, potatoes, onions, rice, lemons, oils, cattle, frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds; sheep on the hoof and fresh mutton and lamb, sugar, butter, cheese, milk and cream, condensed milk, apples, cherries, tobacco, cotton, wool, and hides.

Even a casual reading of this list shows that everything that man must buy for food for himself and his family, if they are to sustain life, and everything that they must wear, including shoes, is to be taxed. The prices of the necessities of life are to be maintained at their present high level, or raised above it, while we all know that in recent months there has been a very large reduction in wages in all industries, particularly those of New England, and it seems to be the sentiment of all large business interests that even further reductions are to be made. This being the case, the only way that hardship and want can be alleviated is by lowering the cost of the necessities of life.

In view of the campaigns carried on by both parties, when seeking election, in favor of the reduction of the cost of living, it is appalling that a bill of this character should have been rushed through the House, without adequate consideration and upon one day's debate, and then an endeavor made to follow out a like policy in the Senate. If a bill such as this is to be passed, it is well that both Senators and the people should know what the results of this legislation will be and upon whom the burden which it imposes will rest.

Let us take up some of the items of the bill separately and follow out logically what the consequences will be if it becomes a law.

The reason for placing a duty of 40 cents per bushel on wheat is to increase the price of domestic wheat 40 cents per bushel. If it does increase the price of wheat to that extent, it means the consumer will have to pay \$236,556,800 more. This figure is based on the average consumption of the United States for the last eight years, which is 591,392,000 bushels. In other words, the consumer will pay \$53.82 for every \$1 collected by the Government, assuming that we will import as much wheat with this duty on as we would with wheat on the free list—which is, of course, unbelievable. The probability is that instead of importing 10,988,000 bushels, which with the 40-cent tax would bring a revenue of \$4,395,200, practically no wheat will be imported, and thus the consumer will be heavily taxed and the Government will receive very little revenue.

The tax that I have figured above will fall on the consumer is too low, for history shows that whenever a tax is placed upon a commodity, the different middlemen add additional amounts on each turnover, and these go into the cost paid by the consumer.

The duty of 40 cents per bushel is the added cost to the first purchaser of wheat. By the time it has taken the form of breakfast food, bread, and so forth, it is fair to assume that, with the manufacturer, wholesaler, and retailer each demanding that he make a profit on this \$236,000,000 of additional capital necessitated by the duty, the ultimate consumer must pay at least \$500,000,000 more than he would if the duty were not imposed.

The wheat statistics for the last eight years show that our total production averaged about 794,485,000 bushels; the total consumption averaged about 591,392,000 bushels. In striking contrast to our annual average import during that period of

only 10,988,000 bushels is the fact that the total exports for the past eight years have averaged about 214,000,000 bushels. In other words, we are putting a duty on a commodity of which we have surplus and of which we are exporting hundreds of millions of bushels; a ridiculous proposition.

When we turn to flour we find that the maximum consumption of wheat for seeding and wheat in the form of flour was in 1915, and amounted to 789,250,384 bushels, and the minimum for the last 15 years—reached in 1916—was 457,605,109 bushels. In the imports of wheat and wheat in the form of flour the maximum was reached in the fiscal year 1918, and was 31,215,213 bushels; minimum in last eight years—fiscal year 1915—715,369 bushels; and the exports of domestic wheat and wheat in the form of flour, maximum, fiscal year of 1919, 287,401,579 bushels; and the minimum for the last eight years, reached during the fiscal year of 1918, 135,990,150 bushels.

Our exports, therefore, are tremendously in excess of our imports. The intent of the policy in this bill is to prevent the western farmer taking his losses. It will result in the burden being shifted onto all of our people. It will mean considering this item alone, as admitted by the Senator from North Dakota, in charge of the bill, that the people of Rhode Island will pay at least \$1.60 more for a barrel of flour.

The proposed duty on corn is 15 cents per bushel. The average consumption in the United States is about 2,800,000,000 bushels; at 15 cents per bushel, the increased price to the first purchaser will be \$420,000,000. By the time the corn reaches the ultimate consumer in the shape of meal, starch, sirup, oil, breakfast food, feed, and so forth, this \$420,000,000 of additional capital will have earned enough to make the cost for the ultimate consumer increase to probably \$750,000,000 a year. If we have the average importations of about 5,700,000 bushels, the Government will possibly collect \$755,000. That is, in order to permit the Government to collect possibly \$755,000 in revenue the consumer must pay \$750,000,000, or \$1 for every mill that goes into the Treasury.

Beans are taxed 2 cents per pound. There are no completed statistics of their production. Six States produced on an average for the last four years 13,910,000 bushels. It is probable that the entire country produces at least 25,000,000 bushels a year. The average consumption of the United States of beans purchased is about 26,325,000 bushels per year, and is growing rapidly, due to the canning of baked beans. Under this duty the increased cost to the first purchaser will be about 95 cents per bushel, or \$25,000,000. This will be fully \$50,000,000 by the time it reaches the ultimate consumer.

If the proposed duty of 25 cents per bushel on potatoes is placed upon the 370,000,000 bushels which is the average consumption of the tubers in the United States, it would amount to \$92,500,000, which would be the increased cost to the first purchaser, and by the time that is passed on to the ultimate consumer it will probably total up to something like \$150,000,000. The revenue collected at the customhouse can not amount to more than \$550,000, because the average imports of potatoes amounting to 2,210,000 bushels will undoubtedly fall off if this tax carries out the theories of the proponents of the bill.

The average consumption of rice in the United States is about 1,000,000,000 pounds. The additional duty of 1 cent will increase the cost to the first purchaser about \$10,000,000, and by the time the rice reaches the ultimate consumer this will amount to fully \$15,000,000.

Rice is now being grown cheaper in this country than anywhere else in the world. There does not seem to be the slightest warrant even on the theory of protection to impose such a duty. In the Orient rice is planted in a seed bed like we plant cabbage seed, and each sprout is afterwards transplanted. It is harvested by cutting it in handfuls, holding a handful of rice in one hand and cutting it with a knife in the other. It is separated from the straw by drawing it through a sort of wooden comb with teeth close enough together to detach the grain. It is winnowed by tossing it in the wind. All these operations are tedious and laborious and demand large numbers of laborers.

In our Texas plantations the rice is planted with a wheat drill in a specially prepared field, a level field with a double furrow around it, so that it will hold water while the rice is growing. After the rice is planted all the attention that is given it is to turn on the water. When ripe the water is drawn off, and it is harvested with a self-binder and thrashed by machinery, operations chiefly performed by machinery with very little labor and consequently at very small cost.

Despite the admission of coconut oil free, our mills increased the domestic production from 31,729,000 pounds in 1912 to 489,858,000 pounds in 1919, an increase of nearly 1,000 per cent in seven years, or from a value of about \$2,500,000 in 1912 to a value of about \$73,000,000 in 1919. A duty of 20 cents per gallon

on this product would only result in our importing enough copra, upon which there is no duty, even in this bill, to compensate for the oil prohibited. From the above statistics it is shown that the imported oil is losing the market in competition with domestic coconut oil. The same can be said of soya-bean oil.

From 75 per cent to 80 per cent of our total production of cottonseed oil, which averages about 1,460,000,000 pounds—over 75 per cent of the world's production—is used in making lard substitutes, 2 to 5 per cent for making oleomargarine, 8 to 11 per cent is exported, and the balance is used principally in soap making. Our imports are less than 1½ per cent of our production.

Coconut, soya-bean, and peanut oil are beginning to compete with cottonseed oil in the lard-substitute and oleomargarine industries. In 1912 these oils were not used to any appreciable extent in the lard-substitute industry, while in 1918 soya-bean oil furnished 4½ per cent, peanut oil 2½ per cent, and coconut oil 1.1 per cent of the total product consumed in this industry as against 83 per cent of cottonseed oil. In 1912 cottonseed oil furnished 91 per cent.

This does not mean that these oils are driving out cottonseed oil because all of them are a little more expensive than the latter, but that the demand is not met by cottonseed oil, so substitutes must be found.

The average consumption of coconut, soya-bean, and cottonseed oil is nearly 2,500,000,000 pounds. A duty of 20 cents per gallon, according to the theory of the other side, would cost something like \$65,000,000 to the first purchaser. The cost to the ultimate consumer in the form of lard, butter substitutes, soap, and so forth, and also the resulting increase in the price of lard and butter, would amount to fully \$150,000,000.

There is a tax of 30 per cent ad valorem on cattle and one of 2 cents per pound upon beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork. Statistics show that the consumption of these dressed meats was over 28,000,000,000 pounds for 1920. Assuming that it is something similar following the imposition of this tax of 2 cents per pound, it would cost the first purchaser \$560,000,000 additional on account of the duty.

The necessary profit that will be charged on the \$560,000,000 additional capital needed by the first purchaser will cost the final consumer probably as much as a billion dollars. Think of it! To impose an additional burden of a billion dollars on the already overburdened American people, and in such a way, on the essential commodities; the food that all must eat if they are to live and work. Everybody has been looking forward to a reduction of prices, and especially is this true in the great industrial centers. Now, when there is a chance of this happening, the people are to be deprived of this benefit, so that the western farmer may not suffer financially from natural causes. More than that, it is a question whether the packers will not gain most by this added duty and the producer receive little or no advantage. That such legislation could be considered seriously would be hard to believe if it were not now before the Senate.

The consumption of butter and substitutes in the United States is about 1,546,000,000 pounds, and of cheese about 367,000,000 pounds, a total consumption of about 1,913,000,000 pounds. That, at an increase of 5½ cents per pound on butter and substitutes and about 1 cent per pound on cheese, would mean an additional cost to the consumers of \$88,707,000.

The imports for consumption will average less than 35,000,000 pounds. The proposed duty to be collected on this imported amount would be about \$1,500,000. The increase in cost shown above is to the first purchaser; by the time the consumer is reached this will be fully \$150,000,000.

Our consumption of condensed and evaporated milk is around 1,300,000,000 pounds. This, with a duty of 2 cents per pound, will amount to an additional cost of \$26,000,000. This duty is not only imposed upon the milk itself, but upon the immediate container of the milk, tending still further to increase the additional cost. By the time the consumer is reached he would have to pay fully \$50,000,000. Our imports of these preparations of milk are about 21,650,000 pounds, which would yield revenue at the proposed rate of \$433,000 if the imports did not fall off.

In addition to the increased cost of the above dairy products it is proposed to increase the rates on fresh milk, cream, and sugar of milk.

One article covered by this item in the so-called emergency tariff bill has heretofore suffered from the shortsighted policy of the other side. During the decade 1870 to 1880 this country was the leading exporter of cheese in the world. In fact, our New York producers of cheese controlled the world's market. We exported about that time over 140,000,000 pounds of cheese a year, principally to the English market, which was and is the

greatest cheese buyer in the world. In 1913 and 1914, fiscal years, we exported less than 5,000,000 pounds. That is, despite our enormously increased sources of production in the great Central West, and the fact that we are furnishing very large amounts of the concentrated animal foods for the dairying interests of Europe, we fell off over 96 per cent in our exports of this staple article of food. This is the reason for the situation. Directly after the Civil War a reciprocity agreement was entered into with Canada whereby we were given a market for our manufactured products in return for admitting Canada on special terms to our markets with her fish and certain agricultural products. Canada at that time was very different from what she is now. She had no great manufacturing industries. She produced hardly enough food for her own consumption. The fisheries and lumbering industries were her only big interests.

Her agriculture was crude. She did, however, raise a little barley, a little hay, a few potatoes and oats that she was compelled to send across the border to find a market. Her railroad facilities were wretched, she had no dairying industry, and all her trade was practically with and through the United States. Beginning about 1870, our farmer friends along the border began to complain that Canadian hay, potatoes, barley, and even firewood, etc., was interfering with their markets. The high-protection tariff men took up their cry, and eventually this little agreement with Canada was ended by the United States.

Ever since that day there has been retaliation between the two Governments. The Canadian Government, upon the loss of the special privileges in the United States markets, began to paternally change the industries of Canada, to encourage the manufacturers, to improve her modes of communication with Europe, especially England and France. She made a reciprocity treaty with France.

She developed the dairying industry. She subsidized steamship lines equipped with cold-storage facilities to carry her butter, cheese, etc., to England. She taught her farmers how to raise dairy cattle and to make cheese especially suited to the English market, and to grow barley, peas, and how to feed this stock instead of offering it for sale. The result was that she quickly took the market for cheese from the United States, as is shown in our export figures covering this period.

She has developed into an active, vigorous manufacturing people, in addition to opening immense tracts of wheatland hitherto deemed worthless. This is so in spite of the fact that great loss often occurs to her wheat growers, for an early frost or a late frost are both equally destructive to the crop of these far northern farmers.

Certain sections of the bill contain added imports on wool and woolen goods. Thus our citizens are to be taxed, and not only upon what they eat but also upon the clothing they are forced to buy. The manufacturer is not to profit, as these additional duties are placed on his raw material, and to meet this cost more is charged for the finished product.

The entire tax will necessarily fall on the ultimate consumer. How any Senator from New England can vote for a measure of this kind, imposing such tremendous burdens upon his constituents, is beyond my comprehension.

There is likewise a tax upon hides of cattle, raw or uncured, of 15 per cent ad valorem. This must necessarily go into the price of our leather goods, including the price of shoes. It seems an outrage to place a tax upon an article so absolutely essential, especially as everyone realizes that shoes have almost trebled in cost within a brief period and how great a hardship this has been to large families of moderate means.

The maximum production of cane sugar in continental United States was 828,800,000 pounds for the calendar year 1908. This production steadily decreased under the high protection afforded under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law until it reached only 325,147,000 pounds for the calendar year 1912. It gained over this amount in 1913 and 1914. In 1915 it fell to the lowest figure in over 25 years, 277,240,000 pounds. Since then, thanks to phenomenal prices, it reached 491,698,000 pounds in 1917 and 568,796,000 in 1918 for the 1919 market. These figures would seem clearly to indicate that cane-sugar growing in the continental United States is a dying industry.

The total production of sugar in the United States proper in 1918 was 2,090,696,000 pounds, and our imports from our island possessions were for the fiscal year of 1919, 2,129,831,000 pounds, nearly 60 per cent of which was from Hawaii. Our total imports for the fiscal year 1919, the year the 1918 crop was marketed, of foreign sugar was 5,625,061,000 pounds, while we exported 1,065,127,000 pounds. The world's production for the calendar year 1918 was 36,596,602,000 pounds, of which 26.9 per cent was beet sugar. As long as the beet industry was fed

by a bounty in Europe, more beet sugar was produced in the world than cane sugar. The percentage of beet sugar produced fell from 64.7 per cent in 1899 to 42.9 per cent in 1911, just before the war. Of course, Europe is now producing more necessary foods than sugar, so the percentage fell to 28.8 per cent in 1917 and 26.9 per cent in 1918.

The beet-sugar industry is an artificial industry. It can never thrive without help. It can hardly thrive with only protection. Generally, it requires a bounty. Beet sugar is a good sugar, but the best of it must sell at a little lower price than the competing cane sugar in the same market. Under the most favorable conditions it costs much more to grow a pound of beet sugar than it does to grow a pound of cane sugar in a cane-sugar region.

The total consumption of sugar in the United States in 1920 was over 10,000,000,000 pounds, a per capita consumption of over 90 pounds, which will increase with cheaper sugar.

For the fiscal year 1919 we imported 5,625,000,000 pounds of sugar and exported 1,065,000,000 pounds, a net of 4,560,000,000 pounds for home consumption. The domestic crop, including that of our island possessions, brought into continental United States, for the fiscal year 1918 was 4,220,000,000 pounds. This would indicate a domestic consumption of about 8,780,000,000 pounds.

The rate of duty proposed would be fully 3 cents additional on Cuban centrifugal sugar, of which our net imports were about 4,400,000,000 pounds, and 3½ cents per pound on other foreign sugar, of which our net imports were about 160,000,000 pounds. The additional revenue to the Government would, therefore, be \$137,000,000, while the additional cost would be something over 3 cents per pound to the first purchaser, or over \$263,400,000.

To the ultimate consumer, in the form of confectionery, pastry, chewing gum, soft drinks, medicines, and table sugar, the added expense would probably be much over \$500,000,000.

I desire to have printed with my remarks a table which shows the estimated total cost and the per capita charge to the consumers, according to the doctrine of the proponents of the bill, and the largest possible revenue that the Government can receive therefrom, on the assumption that there shall be no reduction in importations. Of course it is most unlikely that the amount of revenue indicated will materialize, as the plan of the bill is to prevent many of the commodities covered by the bill from coming into the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record as part of my remarks the table to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Article.	Annual cost to the ultimate consumer.	Annual revenue to the Government.	Per capita cost (per capita of consumers).
Fresh meats.....	\$1,000,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10.00
Wheat.....	500,000,000	4,000,000	5.00
Rice.....	15,000,000	2,000,000	.15
Corn.....	750,000,000	755,000	7.50
Potatoes.....	150,000,000	500,000	1.50
Beans.....	50,000,000	4,785,000	.50
Peanuts.....	50,000,000	1,500,000	.50
Peanut oil.....	15,000,000	5,725,000
Cottonseed, coconut, and soya-bean oil.....	150,000,000	16,000,000
Butter and cheese.....	150,000,000	1,500,000	1.50
Preserved milk.....	50,000,000	433,000	.50
Sugar.....	500,000,000	137,000,000	5.00
Total of above.....	3,380,000,000	276,192,000	131.65
Reduced to 10 months basis.....	2,817,000,000	230,166,000	25.38

¹ Food products only.

Mr. GERRY. From the above table it will be seen that the proposed duties on the few articles tabulated, to say nothing of the other items covered by this bill, such as cotton and certain manufactures thereof, wool and all manufactures, molasses and sirup, hides and skins, tobacco, apples and cherries, will cost the ultimate consumer for the 10 months of the proposed life of the bill at least \$2,817,000,000, or \$2,596,834,000 more than the revenue that can be derived by the Government from the said duties.

The per capita cost to the consumer for certain necessary food products that are found on the table of everyone, rich or poor, is shown to be \$25.38 for the 10 months.

To impose this burden on our people, above all when so many are out of employment, so that the western farmer may not suffer a loss, seems to me an utterly defenseless use of the taxing power of our Government.

In addition to this tremendous burden that would be placed upon our citizens by the enactment of this bill into law, it is very probable that the various Governments will use retaliatory measures and our goods will not be received without the imposition of correspondingly heavy duties. This course of action has been already indicated by statements emanating from officials of Canada and Argentina. If it is adopted it will seriously interfere with our exports.

The State of Rhode Island paid no less than \$13,513,000 in income taxes and \$35,883,000 in corporation, war, and excess-profits taxes. These were freely paid for the benefit of the entire country. We are now asked to pay a tax in time of peace to help a comparatively few persons suffering a loss, and this they will not do without uttering a vigorous protest. There is no reason why the manufacturers in the cotton and woolen industries, the jewelry, the foundry, and machine-shop industries, the dyeing, finishing, and textile industries in my State, as well as the employees of those industries, who already have been hard hit, should be compelled to sustain the loss that should rightfully fall upon the farmers of the West. It seems outrageous that many wage earners who are already suffering and must suffer in the future as the result of unemployment should be asked to pay this enormous tax on the necessities of life as proposed in this bill.

Based upon the per capita consumption in the articles mentioned, I desire to submit a table showing the estimated cost to the people of Rhode Island:

Article.	Estimated cost to the people of Rhode Island.
Fresh meats.....	\$6,500,000
Wheat.....	4,000,000
Rice.....	165,000
Corn.....	4,875,000
Potatoes.....	975,000
Beans.....	650,000
Peanuts.....	650,000
Butter and cheese.....	1,300,000
Preserved milk.....	650,000
Sugar.....	4,550,000
Total.....	24,315,000

That is, it would cost the people of my State \$24,315,000 additional for 10 months for these few items of food. By the time the additional prices were paid for clothing and shoes these figures would be much increased, to say probably over \$30,000,000 for the 10 months, or every man, woman, and child in my State would pay over \$6 in the form of an indirect tax.

In conclusion, I wish to say that in my opinion this kind of legislation is entirely without precedent, is wholly unjustified, and a gross imposition upon the people of the United States, particularly those who reside in the manufacturing communities. No such burden will be placed upon the people if my vote can prevent it.

Mr. SHEPPARD obtained the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question, so that I may clearly understand his attitude, and thereby better understand his argument.

If I understand the Senator correctly, his view is that there should be no tariff of any kind upon food products, because they are necessities of life, and especially if that tariff would add to the cost of the articles consumed in food. Am I correct in that?

Mr. GERRY. The Senator is correct in that.

Mr. McCUMBER. Now, I want to ask the Senator another question. Does the Senator also take the position that there should be no tariff whatever upon the things that the producers of food must buy from his people which will add to the cost of the products which the consumer must use? In other words, is the Senator also in favor of free trade entirely upon the manufactured articles which his State produces?

Mr. GERRY. The attitude of the Senator from Rhode Island is this: He does not think that at this time an added tariff should be placed on the necessities of life, the food products necessary to sustain life, or that additional tariff duties should be placed on the manufactures as proposed in this bill or by amendments thereto.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, to put the matter in a concrete form, I raise wheat sometimes. The last four years I have not raised enough to pay the taxes on my land, but I am still hopeful. Now, I raise that food for the constituents of the Senator in Rhode Island. The things that I purchase from Rhode Island are just as necessary to me as that food is to the con-

stituents of the Senator. I have to wear shoes. I have to wear clothes. The law compels me to do it, even if the weather allowed a different mode; but I have to purchase those things. They are just as necessary for me as food is for the constituents of the Senator from Rhode Island. Now, if I am to sell in competition with the entire world, will the Senator from Rhode Island give me a good reason why I should be compelled, without any competition, to buy the products from his constituents' factories?

It is not a matter of clothing alone. Why, everything that makes a pillowcase, every fabric used in my home, comes from the looms of Rhode Island, and they all bear from 40 to 60 per cent protection. Now, is that exactly fair, as between the Senator and myself, or between the constituents of the Senator and my constituents?

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from North Dakota started in to ask a question that would necessitate a discussion of the entire policy as to whether or not the country should have any form of protection. The Senator from Rhode Island never has posed as a free trader. He believes in a tariff for revenue, but he also feels that the tariff that has been placed in this bill, in the first place, is not a scientific tariff. He does not believe that it will work out as the proponents of the bill believe. He thinks that it is unsound and unjustified, and that the purpose of it can be but one thing, and that is to raise the high cost of living.

The Senator's party were very solicitous to lower the high cost of living when they were engaged in the campaign. They were telling the people of the country what the result would be if they elected the Republican Party to power. Some years ago—in 1908, I think—they did the same thing when they were elected to power on a plea that they would revise the tariff. Of course, the country believed that they would revise the tariff downward; but, instead of revising the tariff downward, when they came into power they revised it upward, on the ground that they had not said how they would revise it. Now, we have history repeating itself. The Republican Party again come into power, one of the grounds being that they favored reducing the high cost of living, and the first thing it does is to jam a bill through the House, practically without consideration, with one day's debate, and then, when it comes over to the Senate, it is amended so that practically every necessity that the poor man must buy is to be taxed by an additional duty.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I am trying, of course, to get at a few fundamentals. I can go right to the Senator's own State and take some of the testimony that was given before the committee. The farmer gets up at 4 o'clock in the morning—I am speaking now of the Rhode Island farmer—and he milks his cows and he brings that milk to the market. That milk is taken to the large cities, and it is delivered by a laborer who receives from \$185 to \$200 per month. The farmer does not get \$40 a month net for the milk that he takes to the city. Does the Senator see any injustice in so protecting that farmer that he will earn half as much or a quarter as much as the man who delivers his milk in Providence?

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Rhode Island does not imagine, in the first place, that the dairy interest in Rhode Island will be very much affected by this bill, because the dairy interest in Rhode Island is such that it deals with local markets. Of course, that does not affect the theory, however, on which the tax in this bill was based. The theory was to raise the price of milk to the consumer.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly; so that the producer of milk, who has to pay a big price for everything that he purchases, shall be placed on somewhere near an equality with the person from whom he purchases.

Mr. GERRY. So that certain producers of milk shall be sustained. The Senator from Rhode Island does not think it is a wise policy to tax the consumer of this country on the necessities of life in order that one particular class may be benefited, and that is exactly what the tariff carried by this bill is intended to do. The manufacturer is taking his loss, but the farmer is not to take his, and at that I am not holding any brief for the manufacturer.

Mr. McCUMBER. I simply want to say, in conclusion, that I think the Senator has made a splendid argument for those people who want to purchase everything they consume as cheaply as possible, and on a free list, and want to sell us everything they produce at as high a price as possible, and on a protected list.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Rhode Island has not made such an argument.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know that the manufacturers in the Senator's State are all good protectionists.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to interject into the discussion between the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Rhode Island the fact that when the present tariff law was before the Senate for debate the Senator from North Dakota characterized it as a free-trade bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the Senator from Mississippi wishes to ask a question, I yield to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, take for granted that the Senator from North Dakota is right; take for granted that the manufacturer in Rhode Island is robbing the general American public and the American consumer under the present law, I would like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island how that could be remedied by enabling the farmer from Dakota to rob them in his turn?

Mr. GERRY. I will say to the Senator that of course two wrongs can not make a right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would it not be much simpler to remove a little of the special advantage which the manufacturers are receiving, if they are receiving it, by a repeal of unjust laws, rather than to increase the number of unjust laws so as to enable somebody else to get a special privilege?

Mr. GERRY. I think that is undoubtedly true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, it is not in the interest of agriculture alone that I give my support to the emergency tariff bill, but in the interest of the Nation as a whole as well.

Justice and wisdom alike require that the reaction from war conditions should fall as equally as possible on every portion of our economic structure.

The sacrifice of any branch of American industry may involve all others, and thus the country itself, in loss defying measure, in chaos which baffles restoration.

The farming element supplies almost one-half the buying power of the Union. Any situation that undermines the prosperity of this element endangers the welfare of every other. Add the fact that agriculture is essential to the existence of every other industry in that it provides the means of life itself, and some conception may be gained of the menace to the Nation embraced in any serious injury to agriculture.

In a recent review of economic conditions issued by the National City Bank of New York, one of the towering financial powers of the world, whose environment and interest are intensely commercial, appears the following summary of its estimate of farm conditions:

If this table is compared with the table above it will be seen that there is ground for the farmer's complaint that the staple products as he sells them are back nearer to prewar prices than they are at retail, or than most of the goods he is obliged to buy. Foodstuffs at retail in December, according to the Bureau of Labor, were 70.5 per cent above 1914 prices. Clothing for which the farmer furnished the cotton and wool at little above prewar prices is 158 per cent above the prewar level, while furniture and furnishings are 205 per cent above that level. * * * The producers of the raw materials can not sell them at the prices they are receiving and buy the finished goods at the prices prevailing for them, and keep the latter industries employed.

Mr. President, this statement contains a warning which Congress can not afford to ignore. If the buying power of the farmer is so diminished that the other industries of the country can not be kept in operation, we are on the edge of calamity.

During the recent war a rapid rise occurred in the prices of all commodities, but there was like increase in the cost of producing them. The cessation of hostilities brought no immediate decline. In fact, the war level continued throughout 1919, throughout 1920, and as to many things, notably transportation, fuel, and labor, still obtains.

The farmer planted and gathered the harvests of 1920 at costs paralleling those of war times. Before he could reach the markets prices of farm products fell suddenly to a point below cost of production, in some instances below cost of gathering alone, entailing losses of the most sweeping and heart-breaking character.

Consider further that while the prices of articles as they leave the farm have suddenly dropped almost to the prewar point, some of them having gone below that point, the prices of these very articles as they reach the consumer, and of most of the articles the farmer must buy, are still from 70 to 250 per cent above the prewar point, and the unfairness of the situation will become more apparent.

The American farmer has already sustained a loss estimated by the Department of Agriculture at \$5,000,000,000, a loss suffered within a period of 60 or 90 days. No other business in the world could have survived such a disaster.

Mr. President, legislation ought to have been enacted long ago to prevent so precipitate and so one-sided a decline. The situation should have been handled as the Democratic Party

handled a similar condition in connection with the War of 1812. The Democrats of that day foresaw that protective legislation would be necessary for such a period after the war as would permit all industries to reach a peace basis without sudden crashes and inordinate declines. So on July 1, 1812, the Democratic Party enacted a tariff law levying duties of 100 per cent in addition to all existing duties on imports, covering all manufactured and agricultural articles with but very few exceptions. It was provided in this law that it should continue as long as the war should last and a year afterward. The war ended early in 1815, and early in 1816, before a year had passed, these double duties were continued by another act until June 30, 1816. On April 27, 1816, a new tariff law was enacted, to become effective on June 30, 1816, with no limit as to duration, and imposing permanent duties ranging from 7½ per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem on practically all manufactured and agricultural products. This was the Madison tariff of 1816.

Legislation of similar purpose in connection with or subsequent to the recent war would have prevented the sensational and terrific crash in farm prices. The present emergency tariff bill is a belated effort to do what should have been done months ago, but will in some degree right the stupendous wrong which the neglect of Congress has brought to agriculture. Indeed, it is the only one of the various measures that have been offered in the farmers' interest which will bring some immediate relief. It imposes temporary duties, to continue for 10 months. It involves no question of permanent tariff policy whatever. It has the same general purpose as had the Democratic tariff legislation following the War of 1812—reconstruction and recovery with a minimum of dislocation, on a basis of fairness to all industry.

Amazing are the contradictions that have marked this debate. Senators tell us that duties on farm products are mere delusions, that in the nature of things they can not increase farm prices, and in the next breath denounce these very duties on the ground that they will impose higher living costs upon the consumer and will prevent reduction in the cost of living.

Senators condemn these duties, saying that they will raise the prices of farm products, and yet these same Senators less than two months ago denounced the Federal Reserve Board, saying that its orders had decreased these prices.

Mr. President, in the stress and struggle of the economic readjustment following the greatest of all wars, agriculture is the under dog. Those big mastiffs, manufacture and commerce, have taken agriculture by the throat and are strangling it with singular indifference to the fact that they are challenging their own destruction.

As for me, I have dedicated myself to the especial service of agriculture, with the conviction that in serving agriculture I serve this Nation in a truer sense than would be the case with any other division of American industry.

I know that the world—that the great big world—
From the peasant up to the king,
Has a different tale from the tale I tell
And a different song to sing.
But for me, and I care not a single fig
If they say I'm wrong or I'm right,
I shall always go in for the weaker dog,
For the under dog in the fight.

RECESS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 15, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, February 14, 1921.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pastor of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Father, by the light of the morning and the glory of the day Thou hast said unto us, I am with thee. Words are too poor for Thy praise. Give unto us the fearlessness of honesty, the patience of earnestness to dwell in the sanctuary of Thy love. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 12, and Sunday, February 13, were read and approved.

CONFERENCE REPORT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report on the bill H. R. 15130, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15130) making appropriations to provide for expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed under the rule.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Eagan	Kelly, Pa.	Rainey, Henry T.
Ashbrook	Eagle	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, John W.
Bakka	Edmonds	Kennedy, R. I.	Randall, Calif.
Bacharach	Ellsworth	Kitchin	Ransley
Baer	Emerson	Kreider	Riordan
Bell	Ferris	Langley	Rowan
Bland, Mo.	Flood	Lehlbach	Rowe
Bowers	Focht	Leshner	Sanders, La.
Brinson	Gallagher	Loneragan	Sanford
Brooks, Pa.	Gallivan	McArthur	Scully
Browne	Gandy	McCulloch	Sears
Brumbaugh	Ganly	McGlennon	Small
Caldwell	Gard	McKenzie	Smith, N. Y.
Candler	Goldfogle	McKiniry	Steele
Cantrill	Good	McLane	Stiness
Carew	Goodwin	Maher	Stoll
Casey	Goodykoontz	Mann, S. C.	Strong, Pa.
Chindblom	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Sullivan
Clark, Fla.	Green, Iowa	Mead	Taylor, Colo.
Classon	Griffin	Milligan	Taylor, Tenn.
Costello	Hamill	Moon	Thomas
Crowther	Harrison	Mooney	Tinkham
Cullen	Hill	Morin	Treadway
Currie, Mich.	Houghton	Mudd	Vare
Dale	Hulings	Nelson, Wis.	Ward
Davey	Hull, Iowa	Nolan	Watkins
Dempsey	Humphreys	O'Connell	Whaley
Dickinson, Mo.	Husted	O'Connor	Wheeler
Donovan	Hutchinson	Patterson	Wilson, Ill.
Doolling	Igoe	Pell	Wilson, Pa.
Doremus	Jacoway	Periman	Wise
Doughton	James, Mich.	Phelan	Woodyard
Dunbar	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, Ala.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and seventy-three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

IMPEACHMENT OF KENESAW M. LANDIS, DISTRICT JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the highest privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio will state his question of privilege.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Speaker, I impeach Kenesaw M. Landis as district judge of the United States for the northern district of Illinois, and in support of same I submit the following facts:

That the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia on the 16th day of May, 1919, entered judgment of \$240,000 against the following for having violated an act of Congress of the United States of July 2, 1890, known as the Sherman Antitrust Act, to wit:

The National League of Professional Baseball Clubs, National Exhibition Co., the Brooklyn Ball Club, the Philadelphia National League Club, the Boston National League Baseball Co., Chicago National League Ball Club, St. Louis National Baseball Club, the Pittsburgh Athletic Co., the Cincinnati Baseball Club, the American League of Professional Baseball Clubs, American League Baseball Club of New York, the Boston American League Baseball Club, American Baseball Club of Philadelphia, the Washington American League Baseball Club, American League Baseball Club of Chicago, the St. Louis American League Baseball Co., the Detroit Baseball Co., the Cleveland Baseball Co., August Herrmann, Bancroft B. Johnson, and John K. Tener (hereinafter called defendants).

That the grand jury of Cook County, Ill., in the month of October, 1920, returned indictments against the following-named persons for conspiracy and obtaining money and goods by means of a confidence game in the matter of baseball games, to wit:

Edward V. Cicotte, Claude Williams, Joe Jackson, Fred McMullen, Arnold Gandil, George Weaver, Oscar Felsch, Charles Risberg, William Burns, Hal Chase, Joseph J. Sullivan, Rachel Brown, Abe Attel.

That all of said persons were baseball players except the last three named.

It is alleged, and common fame has made the facts known, that during the month of November, 1920, and while said cases were still pending, Kenesaw M. Landis, United States judge for the northern district of Illinois, entered into a contract with the defendants above named to act as an arbitrator in all matters of difference in organized baseball at a salary of \$42,500 per annum.

That on the 3d day of March, 1905, Congress provided for an additional judge for the northern district of Illinois, and said Kenesaw M. Landis was on the 18th day of March, 1905, appointed a district judge, and still is one of the district judges of the United States, to wit, the northern district of Illinois, and was at the time he entered into said contract receiving a salary of \$7,500 and expenses, payable monthly out of the Treasury of the United States.

That there are now pending in the northern district of Illinois in the court of Judge Kenesaw M. Landis over 3,700 criminal and civil cases.

In other words, the baseball clubs were found guilty by a jury in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and fined \$240,000. In Cook County, Ill., 13 were indicted for gambling and throwing the game. While these cases were still pending the baseball associations approached Judge Landis with an offer of \$50,000 per annum to act as chief arbiter in baseball matters.

After the baseball associations were found guilty under our laws of being a trust, and while the fine of \$240,000 was still pending against them, they rushed into Judge Landis's court, and for an additional salary of \$42,500 he became the chief arbiter of a trust which was declared illegal and at their request remained on the Federal bench.

This case is now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. What will hinder each member of this court from accepting a like sum from these baseball associations? If Judge Landis can lawfully accept this additional fee, then every other Federal judge in the land can enter the employ of those who violate the laws of the land. The question for Congress to settle is, Can a Federal judge accept a subsidy to perform judicial duties?

Judge Landis has done a great deal of good, but if he wants to retain the confidence and respect as a judge, he must divorce himself from the flesh pots of illegal combinations.

I want to keep the baseball sport clean, so the people will continue to support it. But you can not maintain the sport when you permit the players to throw the game and the baseball magnate to throw our judiciary.

You dare not permit even illegal combinations to tamper with our judiciary by subsidizing them with an additional salary in order to give these combinations a bath so they will again gain the confidence of the public.

On March 3, 1917, the Sixth-fifth Congress passed an act which, in part, provides that:

No Government official or employee shall receive any salary in connection with his services as such official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States.

I, therefore, impeach said Kenesaw M. Landis for high crimes and misdemeanors and charge said Kenesaw M. Landis as follows:

First. For neglecting his official duties for another gainful occupation not connected therewith.

Second. For using his office as district judge of the United States to settle disputes which might come into his court as provided by the laws of the United States.

Third. For lobbying before the legislatures of the several States of the Union to procure the passage of State laws to prevent gambling in baseball, instead of discharging his duties as district judge of the United States.

Fourth. For accepting the position as chief arbiter of disputes in baseball associations at a salary of \$42,500 per annum while attempting to discharge the duties as a district judge of the United States which tends to nullify the effect of the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and the baseball gambling indictments pending in the criminal courts of Cook County, Ill.

Fifth. For injuring the national sport of baseball by permitting the use of his office as district judge of the United States because the impression will prevail that gambling and other illegal acts in baseball will not be punished in the open forum as in other cases.

Wherefore said Kenesaw M. Landis was and is guilty of misbehavior as such judge and of high crimes and misdemeanors in office.

Mr. Speaker, I move that this charge be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary without debate for investigation and report, and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on referring the matter to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that motion for a moment? The gentleman from Minnesota.

IMPROVEMENT OF RED LAKE AND RED LAKE RIVER.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14311) to authorize the improvement of Red Lake and Red Lake River.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14311) to authorize the improvement of Red Lake and Red Lake River, in the State of Minnesota, for navigation, drainage, and flood-control purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, these amendments are all approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of War. It is a House bill with Senate amendments, on the Speaker's table, and I move to agree to the Senate amendments. They are all satisfactory to the friends of the bill, and the Committee on Flood Control has this morning approved them and authorized a motion to agree to them.

Mr. WINGO. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Senate amendments were drawn by the Interior Department?

Mr. STEENERSON. The Senate decided what they were willing to accept and sent it up there for them to perfect the draft.

Mr. WINGO. The Interior Department approves the amendments?

Mr. STEENERSON. They do.

Mr. WINGO. This is a drainage district for Minnesota?

Mr. STEENERSON. It is a drainage district and embraces a large territory, and the Indian reservation is only a part of it, but it is impracticable to carry out the project without affecting the Indians' lands that are within it.

Mr. WINGO. And the gentleman assures the House the Interior Department has approved these amendments?

Mr. STEENERSON. They certainly have; yes. The letter is here.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I hope the day is not far distant when Members of Congress will bring in conference reports and reports from committees and appeal to the House for their passage without having to say that they are approved by some bureau or commission of the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say to the gentleman that I think in this particular instance this is the proper thing.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask the gentleman if this matter is approved by the Chippewa Council?

Mr. STEENERSON. I understand that all factions of the Indians have been before the Interior Department for the last two or three weeks, and that this is a compromise that is satisfactory not only to the Chippewa Council but to the others.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman knows, of course, that this matter has been fully investigated by the Committee on Indian Affairs on various occasions, but it has never come to the attention of the chairman of that committee that the Chippewa Council was favorable to this proposition, due to the fact that all Indian moneys are claimed to be owned by all the Chippewas.

Mr. STEENERSON. They are on record in favor of it.

Mr. SNYDER. I personally have no objection—none at all. I think this is proper legislation and that it ought to be passed, but I do not think this is just exactly the way it should be done.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will permit me to suggest to him in connection with the hope expressed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], I hope we have not deteriorated to the point where a Member of this House can not get information upon which he can rely, from persons who know something about a subject, and not have to depend entirely upon political experts, who undertake to dictate to Members for the source of their information.

Mr. STEENERSON. I certainly appreciate the attitude of the gentleman; but I will say that this bill is also approved by the War Department, because of the navigation interests, and it is perfectly proper that the two departments, one concerned with Indian property and one concerned with navigation, should be consulted, and they have recommended these changes in the bill. They first approved it last June, when the committee of the House passed it, and since then they have studied it and they have reported additional amendments, and, as I say, they are satisfactory to all.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, in connection with what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] said in reference to the department approving this matter, as I understand, it is very essential the department should approve it, because a part of this money comes out of the Indian fund that is under that particular department.

Mr. STEENERSON. Exactly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The question I raised is, Is Congress running the Indian affairs of this country or is it done by some bureau or bureau chief?

Mr. LINTHICUM. The idea I wish to impress is that a part of this money comes out of the Indian fund, which is under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, and therefore they ought to have been consulted in reference to the matter.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Why should they have been consulted about it? This is not their money.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Because they are guardians of the Indians' funds.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. We are guardians of the Indians' funds.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say that the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee does not seem to know, but almost every bill that is brought on the floor of this House is drawn by some department.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do know it, and that is what I am protesting against.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield for a moment?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. CARTER. It has long been the custom to refer bills to the various departments in order that a report might be had from the bureau which will have jurisdiction of the administration of the measure in case it becomes a law. This does not necessarily mean that either committees or Congress must always trail the lead indicated by a bureau chief or department head. Now, let me say that there is a bill now pending on the calendar to reorganize the Indian Bureau, which we are trying to get before this House, and which was drawn by the Committee on Indian Affairs and not by any department or bureau of this Government. In fact, some parts of the bill, I understand, are opposed by both the Indian Bureau and Interior Department. If we can get favorable action from the Rules Committee, we expect to have that bill up before this Congress adjourns, and then Members of the House will have an opportunity to show the faith that is in them by being permitted on that occasion to pass upon the question as to who has the right to mold the policy of one bureau of this Government at least.

Mr. WINGO. Has the gentleman from Minnesota any information on this bill other than that which he has given us?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; a great deal. I have been studying this question for 10 years.

Mr. WINGO. Or these Senate amendments that we are talking about?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes. I have discussed the Senate amendments with the Senators and members of the Senate committee.

Mr. WINGO. And he is willing to leave it to the House with the information that he has given to the House?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; if it is desired—

Mr. WINGO. I am satisfied; but some gentlemen have suspicions of the source of the information.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to make this statement for the benefit of the House: That the gentleman before us now has on various occasions been before the Indian Affairs Committee on this particular question, and the hearings are full of statements that will show that he has made a careful study of the question.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there for a moment?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUBEY. I want to say, for the benefit of my young friend from Kansas, who introduced bills prepared by departments, that we have pending before his committee a rule asking for the consideration by this House of an exceedingly important bill coming from the Committee on Agriculture, the packer bill, that no department had anything to do with. We would like to have him bring in a rule to pass it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the

state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15975, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15975, the naval appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military stores, Marine Corps: Purchase and repair of military equipments, such as rifles, revolvers, cartridge boxes, bayonet scabbards, haversacks, blanket bags, canteens, rifle slings, swords, drums, trumpets, flags, waistbelts, waist plates, cartridge belts, spare parts for repairing rifles, machetes; tents, field cots, field ovens, and stoves for tents; instruments for bands; purchase of music and musical accessories, articles of field sports for enlisted men, signal equipment and stores; purchase and marking of prizes for excellence in gunnery and rifle practice; good-conduct badges; medals and buttons awarded to officers and enlisted men by the Government for conspicuous, gallant, and special service; incidental expenses of schools of application; equipment and maintenance of school, library, and amusement rooms and gymnasiums for enlisted men; rental and maintenance of target ranges, and entrance fees in competitions; procuring, preserving, and handling ammunition and other necessary military supplies; in all, \$500,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire merely to call to the attention of the House the precedent that has been established in the last couple of days in the consideration in the Committee of the Whole of the naval appropriation bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations. I think it is a bad precedent, because in operating under the new rules of the House, we are legislating by subterfuge rather than by direct language. I do not think that that should be done, and I am satisfied that most of the Members of the House feel as I do about it.

Under the heading of "Bureau of Yards and Docks" the Committee on Appropriations provided in this bill about \$2,000,000 worth of new improvements at the various stations and navy yards of the country; \$2,000,000 worth of brand-new improvements, which improvements, under the rules of the House, should have come under the consideration of the Committee on Naval Affairs, just as new ships will, I hope, in the future.

On points of order made by me, the Chair ruled out of the bill new storage houses, new magazine buildings, new other buildings of various kinds intended for the various naval stations of the country. Thereupon the gentleman, having charge of the bill for the Committee on Appropriations introduced an amendment, offered as a substitute for the paragraph, with the language "additional storage facilities"—in one instance \$200,000. Well, the gentleman presenting the amendment knew, or, at least, he should have known—and I am satisfied he does know, and I have no quarrel with him about the matter; he is handling the bill as best he can—he knew that "additional storage facilities" meant the erection of new buildings in certain yards. I am satisfied that every Member who was then on the floor of the House knew positively that that word "additional" was merely a subterfuge; that the amounts—\$200,000 in one instance and \$900,000 in another instance—were for the purpose of erecting new buildings. But the Chair, of course, had to take the language of the amendment as it was offered on its face value. It read "additional storage facilities," and the amendment was held to be in order.

Now, if an amendment of that kind is held to be in order, I am wondering what will happen if the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations having naval affairs in charge will present an amendment to his bill for additional naval facilities, \$17,000,000 or \$170,000,000, and undertake to construe that amendment to mean additional fighting facilities, additional destroyer leaders, additional submarines, additional gunboats, or additional battleships and battle cruisers that may be desired by the Navy General Board, the highest naval authority in this country, in order to round out the American Navy and make it a substantial fighting mass. Will it not be reasonable for the

gentleman having the bill in charge to say that the Navy is now, in effect—that it is a fighting mass, such as storage facilities and magazine facilities; and in order to make that fighting mass more efficient and to improve its generally intended efficiency on the high seas these additional facilities are necessary?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is safe. Whenever they try to pay for the new building construction out of this appropriation the auditors would stop them. Was not the excuse given on the floor by the chairman for overruling the point of order made by the gentleman the ground of expediency in order to save the bill?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. I do not think the Comptroller of the Treasury Department will allow any of this money to be spent on any of these naval stations for new buildings if he knows they are new buildings. I am inclined to think that the Senate will change the language inserted in the bill by the House, and that the bill will come back here as originally intended, for new construction, just as it would if the gentleman should attempt to cover into this bill new construction for ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Just as I believe the comptroller and the auditor will construe the legislation, if the gentleman amends his bill and provides for the additional fighting craft desired by the Naval General Board. What will become of legislation in the House if existing rules permit or even suggest practice of this kind? That is the matter I desired to bring to the attention of this House. I maintain that sooner or later, with the conditions under which we are now operating, the rules will have to be changed. They will only be changed by Members on the floor voicing publicly their desires in the premises. It has been suggested that I wasted time on Friday and Saturday in objections to this bill. Gentlemen, I am not opposed to the naval bill. I am not opposed to these various paragraphs or the desires of the Navy Department or the desires of the Navy itself. The Navy, of course, must be maintained. But I made my various points of order because I desired to bring to the attention of the House the unreasonableness of the rules, and that because of the rules we are now legislating by subterfuge rather than by definite language.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know that the rule in respect to the consideration of legislation on appropriation bills has not been changed at all?

Mr. BRITTEN. I do know that the rules in respect to legislation and appropriations in the House have been seriously changed in the past year.

Mr. MADDEN. With reference to legislation on appropriation bills, or appropriation on legislative bills, the rules are exactly the same as they were 20 years ago.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, the gentleman is afraid that some of his power as one of the steering committee, or as a member of the appropriating committee, or as one of the House leaders, is going to be taken away from him if we revert to our old system, and he has to go back to his original Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman this, that I do not care whether I am on any committee or not.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman always says that.

Mr. MADDEN. I mean it. You can take me off from any committee of which I am a member at any time and I will not grumble about it. I will take care of myself.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is a valuable and powerful Member of this House, for whom I have the greatest admiration. He properly belongs on the steering committee and on the Appropriations Committee, where he is constantly performing good service.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels heretofore authorized, to be available until expended, \$53,000,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I move to strike out the last word. This item provides for \$53,000,000 on account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels heretofore authorized, to be available until expended.

I wish the gentleman from Michigan might tell us what is contemplated under this item and the other items under increase of the Navy—just what is covered by them.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. On Saturday a number of requests were made by gentlemen on both sides of the House for a little time in general debate when we reached the construction program. I wonder if the gentleman from Michigan has that in mind now?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as I stated to gentlemen when disarmament was being discussed on other items of the bill, that considerable liberality would be allowed when we reached this item of increase of the Navy. If an understanding as to time is desirable, of course, I shall be glad to make it, but with the statement that liberal opportunity for debate will be granted, perhaps that is all that will be necessary.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know whether anyone desires to discuss the items to any extent, but I suggest that the three items for increase of the Navy, including the total increase, be all read, and be all subject to amendment, and that then, if there is any arrangement made for debate, it should include all of those items. They are all together.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think the suggestion is a good one. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the three items covering the increase in the Navy may be read.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Including the total?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Including the total, and that after that amendments be in order to any one of the items.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the items beginning in line 18, page 42, down to and including line 5, page 43, may be read and considered en bloc, and that amendments may be in order to any of the items. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the items.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels heretofore authorized, to be available until expended, \$53,000,000.

Increase of the Navy, torpedo boats: On account of submarine torpedo boats heretofore authorized, to be available until expended, \$4,000,000.

Increase of the Navy, armor and armament: Toward the armor and armament for vessels heretofore authorized, to be available until expended, \$33,000,000.

Total increase of the Navy heretofore authorized, \$90,000,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the inquiry put by the gentleman from Illinois as to what this \$90,000,000 item is for, I will say that in 1916 a building program, involving, I think, 157 vessels, was authorized. During the war the work on the larger ships was not pushed forward, but on the smaller craft it was, so that the destroyers were, as I recall, all or nearly all finished, and the same was true of the submarines. No money is made available out of this item for any construction except what was authorized in the program of 1916 and except what is now actually under construction. It includes 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, 9 miscellaneous ships, such as 1 gunboat, 1 hospital ship, 1 ammunition ship, 1 repair ship, 2 destroyer tenders, 1 submarine tender, 1 aircraft tender, and 26 submarines, making a total of 51 vessels that are now under construction, and will be taken care of out of this appropriation of \$90,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. OLIVER. Would it not be well to put in a proviso limiting the expenditure of this money to the vessels that have already been contracted for?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I have no objection to that.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, in the absence of a provision of that kind the department could expend the money on vessels which have been heretofore authorized and for which no contracts have been let.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama meets with my entire approval and I think will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. I will prepare an amendment to that effect.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There are a few destroyers authorized under the 1916 program which have not yet been started, and it is not the purpose of the Navy Department to build any of them. We have a great many more destroyers than those provided for in the 1916 program. A large number were built out of a general fund put into the hands of the President.

Mr. OLIVER. I think we should have something to make effective the clear intention of the House.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I would not object to a limitation providing that no part of the \$90,000,000 shall be used for the construction of ships not already under construction. Every ship that is contracted for is under construction.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman tell us how many keels for battleships and cruisers have been laid since the signing of the armistice?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I can not tell exactly; but I think that all of the keels of the battle cruisers have been laid since the signing of the armistice.

Mr. BLANTON. How many?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Six of them. During the war a great many lessons were learned relative to the value of different ships and relative to the construction of ships. Immediately following the war the Navy Department took up the question of the 1916 program to determine whether or not anything had happened which would make it inadvisable to construct any part of it along lines which had been prepared before the war. That was especially true as to the battle cruisers. They had a council of the leading officers of the Navy, including, as I recollect, members of the General Board—Admiral Sims, Admiral Wilson, Admiral Rodman—and other distinguished officers. Without going into the details as to changes agreed upon—and no one would expect me to do that—various important changes were made in the design of these battle cruisers as a result of the experience growing out of the war. Subject to these changes, it was the unanimous scientific opinion of the Navy that the battle cruisers should be constructed, and the work is now in progress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Other navies, notably that of Great Britain and Japan, have this type of ship. While, of course, there is always more or less dispute among professional men as to the value of different types, I think it is the unanimous opinion of the Navy that inasmuch as other navies have this type of ship that our Navy ought to have at least these six that are under construction. They are wonderful ships. Nothing like them in the way of tonnage, speed, or gun power has ever been constructed. They are eight hundred and some odd feet in length; they carry twelve 16-inch guns, a remarkable gun power; and will have a speed of 33½ knots.

The ships are to be built under a cost-plus fixed commission contract, so that the actual cost will depend very largely on the manufacturing costs which will prevail in the coming months. It was estimated at first that they would cost about \$30,000,000 each, but with the increased costs during the war, the estimates ran up as high as \$40,000,000 each. But there seems to be a pretty unanimous opinion among business men that manufacturing costs are bound to slip back at least 20 per cent, and possibly much more. I am inclined to think it is perfectly safe to assume that the manufacturing costs will decline at least 20 per cent below what they were during the war, when these estimates were made, and in that event the cost of these ships will run about \$30,000,000 each.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman stated that the ships were to be built on a cost-plus contract, with a definite commission. What does the gentleman mean by a definite commission?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My recollection is that the contracts provide for the payment of a commission of \$2,000,000 regardless of the cost of the ships.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a fixed sum and not a fixed per cent.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It is a fixed sum. The contractor gets \$2,000,000 commission, which seems to be rather reasonable on a ship costing \$30,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are any of these ships being constructed at Government navy yards?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; two of them are being constructed at the League Island Yard in Philadelphia.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman said the commission was \$2,000,000. Admiral Taylor said that the *Massachusetts* was being constructed on a commission of \$1,650,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The battle cruisers are somewhat larger and more expensive than the battleships. I think I am correct in my statement of \$2,000,000 commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. How is that arrived at? For instance, the contract for building a battleship would contemplate that the contractors were to furnish everything.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The Government pays the contractor actual cost of manufacture plus a fixed lump-sum commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that mean that the commission represents what the Government is to pay for the actual building of the ship? Does the Government furnish the material and the contractor get a certain sum for building in addition to his commission?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. All manufacturing costs are returned to the contractor plus his commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. Two million dollars?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. He furnishes all the labor and the dockage and everything?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The contractor is reimbursed for all manufacturing costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. He gets the \$2,000,000 for his expert supervision.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. He is reimbursed for his manufacturing costs and then is paid his profit of \$2,000,000. That represents on a contract of \$30,000,000 less than 7 per cent.

Mr. BARKLEY. He gets an additional allowance for wear and tear upon his machinery?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Everything that he gets out of this contract over and above the return of his manufacturing costs is \$2,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that the \$2,000,000 is clear profit.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; profit which is not exorbitant if we consider the large amount involved in the contract.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. This is a fee or compensation for the use of his machinery?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well—

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, in order to clear up what has been suggested on the floor to the effect that the Navy Department buys the material to go into these ships, the contractor really buys the material, with the assistance of the Navy Department. Bids are taken for everything that enters into the construction of the ships. When those bids are approved by the department the contractor makes his purchase. The fixed fee profit, of course, cares for his overhead to a very large degree and cares for his investment in his plant to a large extent and for his natural fixed charges to a very large extent, and if money is saved in taking bids for anything that enters into the construction of the ship, of course, the Government pays that full amount, the fixed fee being established in advance of any work at all on the ships.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Assuming that disarmament may be brought about in the near future, and we all hope that it will be, is it not possible to postpone the building program and greatly reduce this appropriation at this time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In my judgment it will cost as much to discontinue this program as it would to finish it.

That is to say, when you enter upon the construction of ships costing \$30,000,000 and make all of your contracts for material, with the work in progress, and some ships nearing completion, and then stop that work and cancel all your contracts and reimburse everybody entitled to reimbursement and pay a commission which the manufacturer would be entitled to by reason of having his contract canceled, it would necessitate an appropriation of as much money to settle up as it would to finish the program. In that event we would lose the \$535,000,000 that we had put into these ships; we would lose all that we put into settling up the canceled contracts and in the end would have no

ships. Such a course would not commend itself to the good judgment of Congress or the country, I am sure.

Mr. DOWELL. Then, if disarmament comes within a short time, the gentleman's judgment is that it will be no more expensive to construct these ships now than it would be to stop the building program entirely, awaiting decision on that account.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman can see at a glance that a mere suspension of the construction would be perfectly hopeless and impossible. That course would suspend the workman's hammer in the air. He would not know whether to strike or lay the hammer down. The manufacturer would not know what to do. The Navy Department would not know what to do. The damage and the expense would pile up every day under demoralizing uncertainty. Suppose we said, "We will wait for six months before we go on." These ships are 800 feet long. They are on expensive building ways, and you would have to settle the damage that you would do a great shipyard by keeping 800 feet of its ways idle for six months. Cancellation of this program would be bad, but suspension would be hopeless.

Mr. DOWELL. Then the gentleman's judgment is that it would be just as expensive to the Government to stop the work as to continue the work that is now under way?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think if we undertook to take off the ways these ships, stop all construction where it is today, we would have to appropriate as much for loss and damage as we would to finish the ships. That is my judgment. The machinery, of course, would be of no use for anything else. These battle cruisers have engines in them of 180,000 horsepower. So far as I know, nothing like them has ever been constructed in the world. Nobody would buy the engines. They are in various stages of manufacture. The material is being fabricated in many places by many subcontractors and the damage resulting from cancellation would be enormous.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Surely the gentleman does not mean to say that where we provide an appropriation of \$33,000,000 for armor and armament, and an appropriation of \$53,000,000 for hulls and outfits of machinery, we would pay as much for armor which never was made—

Mr. BUTLER. But it is made.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And machinery which never was constructed as we would if we were to take it and use it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman will understand that the construction of these engines is not going forward in one place. Material is being fabricated in many places.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But if we stop the fabrication of it, the gentleman does not mean to say that we would pay as much to settle the damages, where the machinery is not fabricated, as we would if we had it and paid for it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My impression is that if you stopped work on the ships and set out to get them off the ways—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But that will have to be done anyway.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; it will not. When the ships are ready to launch they are slid off the ways and there is no damage, but the gentleman must recognize the tremendous difficulty of clearing the ways of a great steel ship where considerable work has been done upon it but which is not ready for launching. It would have to be torn down, and the cost would be enormous.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. While I do not recognize that it would be so great, I do recognize that material can easily pay for all cost of dismantling; and I would like—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Suppose the Government had entered into a contract for a building here on Pennsylvania Avenue that was to cost \$30,000,000, and that the building was half completed. Does not the gentleman think it would cost as much to take the unfinished building down and settle the canceled contract as it would cost to finish the building?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Let me put the case this way: Suppose you contract to build a building that cost \$30,000,000 and had excavated for it, and had done practically nothing else. Does the gentleman—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is not this case.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is the case of part of these battleships.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well there is not very much done.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is wrong.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Not until I make this statement as to just what has been done.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In just a moment. These contracts have all been awarded for all these ships. Fabrication of material is going forward in many places. The engines are made, say, at Schenectady, put together there, but the material, the brass, the copper, the steel, and all that is fabricated elsewhere, and while it might show in the report that only a small percentage of construction had actually been completed in the yard where it was being put together, the fact is that the material is being fabricated and the work in progress far beyond what it will show in the yard where the ship is being assembled. Nobody can say exactly how much it would cost to settle up if construction were discontinued. I pursued the inquiry in reference to two of these ships that had advanced the least, and the testimony was that it would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$10,000,000 to suspend construction on the *Massachusetts*, which is the least advanced of any of them.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not this the situation? My understanding of it from some talk I have had with the gentleman from Michigan is that the subcommittee—and I assume the committee—after some inquiries with regard to the two battleships which have least progressed with regard to the program, came to the conclusion that neither the subcommittee nor the full committee would be justified in recommending a complete abandonment of any part of the program. They did not feel that was quite within their jurisdiction; that the question with them was how much shall we appropriate to carry forward the coming fiscal year the program under way; and what I had understood the committee to consider was what might be the least sum that in their opinion could be economically expended for these purposes, assuming that they had not jurisdiction and they were not of the opinion they were justified in recommending a complete abandonment, and the sums carried in the bill were simply based upon what the committee believed an economic and perhaps the lowest economic expenditure on the program as it stands.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well that is a good statement of the situation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. What are the estimates?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The estimates for the complete work—

Mr. BUTLER. So that the House will understand what the gentleman did.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan (continuing). Leaves a balance, as I recollect, of \$434,000,000, five hundred and thirty-odd million having already been expended. That \$434,000,000, it is evident, can be reduced by whatever reduction can be effected in manufacturing cost. If we take off 20 per cent, or one-fifth, it will take off about \$90,000,000, leaving about \$360,000,000 to finish the program. The Navy Department asked \$180,000,000 evidently on the theory we wanted to finish the program in two years; but the Committee on Appropriations did not see any special reason why it should be rushed, and so provided only \$90,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thought possibly some agreement as to time to be taken on this building program could now be reached. However, if gentlemen prefer, we can run on in this way a while longer.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, in 1916 the naval program provided for about 157 ships, and the cost of the ships was expected to be something between \$500,000,000 and \$600,000,000 and they proceeded to carry out that program. It was somewhat delayed on account of the war, and on the second estimate the total expenditure required to carry this program under war costs would amount to about \$900,000,000. Five hundred and thirty-four million dollars of it had already been expended. Some ships have been completed, some are on the ways. The percentage of completion is based on a study of the ship in the dock and not on the amount of work that is done in the factories, and while only 10 per cent may be said to be completed, because that is the situation in the docks, there may be 20 or 30 per cent of the ships completed of fabricated material which has not yet been put in place on the ship. Last year the Committee on Naval Affairs appropriated about \$104,000,000 to carry out this program. This year the Committee

on Appropriations has recommended \$90,000,000 to carry out the program, but the estimate is that the \$90,000,000 of this year is equal to \$110,000,000 of last year, and will produce as much work.

We believe that \$75,000,000 next year will be equal to \$90,000,000 this year, because of the lowering of prices. We believe the ships that are under way ought to be completed in fairly decent time, but we can not stop the program, because if we do, you will not only find yourself with a ship that can not be floated, and will take up all the space in the docks or in the yards, but you will also find yourselves in a position of being compelled to adjudicate the contracts for material that has been fabricated everywhere in the United States that is to go into these ships. I am willing to admit that if the \$33,000,000 provided for in this bill for armor plate and \$53,000,000 provided for hulls was an initial appropriation and no work had been done, that it would not cost anything to eliminate it. But with \$534,000,000 already spent on ships that are going to cost \$900,000,000, and contracts made and work being done everywhere in the United States on every ship, you can not eliminate these appropriations without paying the money for the work that has been done. You not only compel the Government to pay the money but you compel them to abandon their property and throw it into the scrap heap. That is what you would do with the ship that is 10 per cent complete. You can not take it apart and put it back in shape to use for some other purpose. It has got to be used for the purpose for which it was intended, and it is economical not only to expend the money rather than to discontinue the contract, from the mere standpoint of money itself, but it is also economy in the insurance which the completion of the ships gives to the security of the country.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Can the gentleman tell us when the money already appropriated will be exhausted by the contracts already made?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not tell you; but at the end of the fiscal year the fair assumption is that this money that is to be appropriated will be needed to carry on the work for the next fiscal year.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That may be an inference, but it may not be justified by the facts.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the facts justify it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There will be a small balance at the end of this fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. I maintain that the wisdom of the situation will be best served by carrying on the work, not by trying to complete it all to-day or to-morrow, but by carrying it on at such a rate of progress as will complete these ships within the next three years. And when we have them completed we will have a Navy that, as I understand the situation, will be equal to any navy in the world; whereas if we quit now, every ship that is on the ways will be put into the scrap heap after we have spent on them \$500,000,000, I think, or a little more.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. As I understand, there are about \$450,000,000 and odd of an estimate remaining yet?

Mr. MADDEN. Under the increased war cost.

Mr. McKENZIE. Now, if \$90,000,000 this year will take care of \$110,000,000 that was done last year and \$75,000,000 next year will do the work—

Mr. MADDEN. It will reduce the \$400,000,000 down to \$300,000,000 before you get through.

Mr. McKENZIE. But are we so bound by contracts or arrangements that we have to spend the \$450,000,000?

Mr. MADDEN. You are only bound by what it costs. You are bound by the contracts, but not to pay more than the actual cost. So that if the conditions of the time become such that the costs will be lower, the Treasury of the United States will profit by it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then it is economy to postpone some of this work?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not agree with that, because if it postpones the work it will put some of the ships that are under way into the scrap heap, place them into a state of deterioration, and compel the Government to pay damages for the material already fabricated in various places throughout the United States and that is to go into these ships. And if the gentleman

thinks the postponement of the activity under conditions which would compel the payment of as much for damages as it costs to complete the ships, then I do not understand his reasoning.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not mean postponement in the way of not doing anything.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman means we are doing the right thing in this bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. Only such work as we can postpone.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what this committee is doing now. Instead of doing it all in one year, they are trying to conserve the Treasury and also conserve the ships that will act as the guard of the outer walls of the United States against any enemy in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Eight years ago, when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] and I came into this House together—and I am very glad to have had the honor to come into it with him—the annual appropriation for the Navy was \$136,000,000. During the intervening time since then the greatest menace to the peace of the world has been destroyed. One of the excuses or reasons which has been habitually given by Great Britain for maintenance of her great navy has been the fear of Germany. Now, it is well recognized by everybody that Germany is wholly powerless, both on land and sea, so far as any danger to the peace of the world is concerned. By the expenditure of an amount of money estimated to be \$348,000,000,000, which is more wealth than would be destroyed if an earthquake should swallow up the entire United States and Canada, and by the loss of more than 30,000,000 men either in war or by sickness and disease, and the loss of life among the civil population of the belligerents, that one menace to the peace of the world has been destroyed. Now, the only possible reason, therefore, that any of the allied nations have for this race in armaments which seems to be still in progress, is that they are afraid of one another. There is no longer any fear that Germany will menace the peace of Europe or of America. Therefore, neither England, Japan, nor the United States has any reason to continue the enormous expenditure of money for armaments on account of fear of Germany. Therefore, it seems to me logical that if we continue to engage in this race for enormous armaments we are doing it by implication against either Japan or England, because those are the only nations that have the slightest possibilities of engaging in war in the near future, and it follows also that the only possible reason for any expensive armament on the part of England would be that she is afraid of either Japan or the United States, and likewise the same reason would actuate Japan, that she is afraid of England or the United States.

Following the signing of the armistice, and following the announcement of our Navy Department that it proposed to continue this enormous expenditure for armament and increase of the Navy, and this enormous increase in the number of battleships and cruisers, a certain statesman of Japan announced that they also had enlarged their program, basing that increase upon our enlarged program; but it is a significant fact that, notwithstanding that announcement, not an additional dollar has been appropriated by the Japanese Government, as I am informed, for an enlarged program of new construction for the construction of battleships and cruisers.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Does not the gentleman know that just within the last 10 days the Japanese Congress—I will call it by that name—voted by more than 5 to 1 to do the very thing that the gentleman says they have not done?

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that while that has been done in one of the branches of the Japanese legislative body, it has not become a law.

Mr. BEGG. No; it has not become law.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. May I give the gentleman a little information that I have obtained officially?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. BUTLER. The Japanese Government has appropriated officially for four battle cruisers and four battleships, and has voted authoritatively for four additional battle cruisers and four additional battleships.

Mr. BARKLEY. When has that been done?

Mr. BUTLER. In the last few weeks; 16 vessels in all. And England is now building three enormous battle cruisers—and we can not learn, although we have tried pretty hard to

learn, for what nation Great Britain is now building those three enormous battle cruisers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Kentucky was quite correct in his original statement. The appropriation made by Japan recently was for the purpose of carrying out her "8 by 8 program," as it is called, which was decided upon three years ago, and it was not for the purpose of further construction. England is not building a single big ship, and has not been building one for several years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. The statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is in line with what I had in mind. I made the statement that the Japanese Government had not appropriated a single dollar for any enlarged naval program which in the immediate past has been provided for or authorized. The appropriations which have been made are to carry out the program that was inaugurated a few years ago. The fact is that Great Britain has positively scrapped all her battleships and cruisers of the dreadnaught type, if I am correctly informed, and three battleships of the type of the *Hood* which were in course of construction by Great Britain have been completely broken up, and the material has been scrapped for other purposes.

Not only that, but Great Britain has reduced her naval personnel since the armistice from 450,000 men to 105,000 men, which is 30,000 below our own personnel in the Navy. If the menace of German militarism, both on land and sea, has been destroyed, why is it not possible for the allied nations, who can only prepare for war against one another, to come to some agreement either to limit armament altogether or to have a naval holiday for four or five years?

Now, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] a few days ago announced that the golden hour for the making of that compact on the part of the United States would have arrived when we shall have completed this 3-year program, which, I understood him to say, had been extended as to time from three years to five years, and that it would not be completed until the expiration of five years; and if the same thing is true of that program as has been true of other programs, by the end of five years most of that which was completed at the beginning of the program will have become obsolete and will have to be scrapped.

This appropriation bill carries practically \$400,000,000. The Army appropriation bill, which we passed through the House last week, carried practically \$340,000,000, making nearly \$750,000,000 which we are appropriating for the Army and the Navy for next year, two years after the armistice was signed and hostilities ceased, which is more money than we appropriated for the entire expenses of our Government prior to the war with Germany, exclusive of the Post Office Department.

Mr. SABATH. Not including the fortification bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and that does not include the fortification bill, which is to be brought in in a few days. Prior to the Spanish-American War we had an Army of 25,000 men, which was adequate for all our purposes. After we had acquired the Philippine Islands and assumed certain burdens in Cuba and Porto Rico and other islands of the sea we increased the size of our Army to 100,000 men, and 100,000 men constituted our Army from the time of the Spanish-American War until the war broke out in Europe in 1914, and we got into it in 1917.

That increase from 25,000, which was the size of our Army before the Spanish-American War, to 100,000, the size of our Army after the Spanish-American War, was an increase of 400 per cent. After the World War was ended and the armistice was signed we passed an Army reorganization bill, in which we provided for a maximum Army of 280,000 men, and the Secretary of War enlisted an Army of 230,000 men. We have ordered that to be reduced to 175,000 men.

I ask in all seriousness and in all earnestness, What reason is there for a larger standing Army in the United States now than in the interval between the Spanish-American War and the World War, when we had an Army of only 100,000 men? Where is there any domestic trouble that demands this large Army? Where is there any internal danger that requires 175,000 men in the Army of the United States? There are our island

possessions, the Philippine Islands and Hawaii and Porto Rico and others, which are no more of a menace to us now than they were during the period from the Spanish-American War to the time of the World War, and yet we are spending each year now for the Army and Navy more money than it cost us to run the entire Government of the United States prior to the outbreak of the World War, exclusive of the Post Office Department, which has been, generally speaking, self-sustaining. During the last 10-year period the amount of money appropriated by Congress to pay for past wars and to prepare for future wars has been more than 70 per cent of the entire appropriations of the Federal Government, and that does not include the expenses which we incurred during the World War, which would run the proportion up to more than 90 per cent. That includes merely the normal increase and the normal expenditures for the Army and Navy and payment for past wars. If the size of the Army and Navy shall be doubled, trebled, or quadrupled after each war, how long can the people endure it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more. I do not often trespass upon the time of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to state to the gentleman from Kentucky that there are some reasons why we need a larger force in our Regular Military Establishment now than we had at the time of the Spanish-American War. One reason is that we have the Aircraft Service, we have the Chemical Warfare Division, we have the tank unit, we have a number of other things that the Great War has demonstrated are necessary in a military establishment, and therefore we are compelled to have a larger force.

Mr. BARKLEY. In reply to the gentleman from Illinois, I will suggest that nobody now looking out on the horizon of the world can see any indication that we are in any more danger of immediate attack than we were at any time between the Spanish-American War and the German war.

Mr. McKENZIE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that basing it upon the proposition that we are in danger of attack, we do not need a larger Army now than we did from 1898 to 1914 or 1917.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The amount of expenditure is not quite measured by the size of the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that it costs more to run an Army of a given size now than it did prior to the World War.

Mr. FESS. Our Army is now about three-fourths more in size and our Navy is not quite double, yet it costs about four times as much to run them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that fact; but still that does not account for all the enormous increase in the expenditure that we are outlaying now for military purposes. We have already appropriated nearly \$5,000,000,000 during the Congress that is now in session in spite of all efforts at economy.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield to allow me to offer an amendment in his time?

Mr. BARKLEY. If it will not be taken out of my time.

Mr. HICKS. The gentleman will lose the floor if he does that.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Then I will offer the amendment later.

Mr. BARKLEY. Now, we have appropriated and are appropriating in this Congress about \$5,000,000,000, and the announcement is made from official sources that the taxation of the people can not be relieved to any appreciable extent during the next four or five years; and so in the next Congress we are confronted with the task of not reducing taxation, because we can not reduce taxes as long as we spend four or five billion dollars each year. We can not reduce it. All we can do is to shift the burden from one shoulder to another in an effort to equalize that burden which is now being borne. But what I want, in the near future, is to be afforded the opportunity to vote for a reduction in taxation, and I appreciate the fact that it can only be done by a reduction in the expenses of our Government. It seems to me a ridiculous thing, in this age of Christian civilization, that any nation is required to spend more than 80 per cent of its revenues

raised by taxation either in paying for past wars or in preparing for future wars, and I hope that this disarmament program may be carried out.

I hope the incoming President will call a conference which will bring about an agreement and a result in which the Republican Party will have confidence, as it seems to have no confidence in agreements entered into by others. I care nothing about the politics of it. I would just as soon have this disarmament program come about under Republicans as under Democrats, and I hope that one of the first official acts of the incoming President will be to call the allied nations of the world together for a conference, and that out of that conference will come something that will make it possible to relieve the people from the enormous burden of taxation which they are now carrying; and I hope that in the immediate future there may be a material reduction of the expenses of government. I presume it will be impossible in this bill. I do not know that a specific reduction of this bill can be obtained. I do not claim it would be wise to stop the construction now under way on these battleships and cruisers, but I do hope that before we are called upon to pass another military bill or naval bill we will be able to reduce them more materially than we have those now under consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brooks of Illinois: Page 43, line 5, after the figures "\$90,000,000" insert "Provided, That no part of this sum shall be expended until the President of the United States shall have invited the Governments of all nations to send accredited delegates to an international convention to be held in the United States to consider ways and means of bringing about joint disarmament."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this is merely a limitation.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; it directs the President to do a particular thing.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not so understand it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It directs the President to do so and so.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; the President has the authority to do the thing now. This does not direct him to do it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; it does.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Chair has already ruled; but the amendment simply provides that no part of this appropriation shall be expended until the President does something which he is now authorized to do. It is a pure limitation on the appropriation. It does not direct the President to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois contend that the President has authority now to invite the Governments of all nations to send delegates to an international convention to be held in the United States with a view to bringing about general disarmament?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know whether he has the authority in that case or not; but that would not make any difference with the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY. He has the authority under the law passed in 1916.

Mr. MADDEN. That was only current law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the gentleman think that the constitutional authority that authorizes the President of the United States to make treaties, that authorizes him to deal with foreign nations, would authorize him to call such a conference without any other specific legislation?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am inclined to think that there is statutory authority forbidding the President to extend invitations without the authority of Congress, but Congress has the right on an appropriation bill to limit an appropriation—it may have in contemplation subsequent legislation which will authorize the President to call it. This does not confer on the President authority if he does not have that authority now. If the Chair thinks this amendment would confer authority on the President that he does not now have, that would be legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois contend that it is in order for Congress, by way of limitation on an appropriation, to prohibit the expenditure of a fund until some executive official shall have done something which Congress had not previously authorized him to do and which there is no specific authority of law for the executive official to do?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment purporting to be a limitation authorizes the Executive to do something which the Executive is not now authorized to do, that

would be legislation, although in the form of a limitation; but to provide that no part of the money shall be expended unless the Executive does something he is not now authorized to do, if the amendment does not give the authority to the Executive, then it is a mere limitation. I do not think this amendment authorizes the President to do anything which he is not now authorized to do. I do not think under this amendment the President would be authorized by virtue of the amendment to call an international convention. If it authorized him to do that it would be legislation. I think the Chair will see the distinction between the limitation and between a proposition under the guise of a limitation granting authority to the Executive to do something which the Executive could not otherwise do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sees the distinction between those propositions, but the Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if it is proper by way of limitation upon an appropriation to provide that no part of the appropriation shall be expended until an executive official does something which he has no right under the law to do?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly; I contend that it is in order unless the authority to do the thing is contained in the amendment. In many cases there have been rulings on the subject. Where an amendment was offered as a limitation and the Chair has construed the so-called limitation as a direction to an executive to do something, of course that is legislation. If that was the case here, it would be legislation and not a mere limitation.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If there is no law that authorizes the President to call an international convention, and this amendment does not give him any authority to do it, it is a limitation on the expenditure of the money. Would this amendment prevent the expenditure of the money in the face of those facts?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would act to prevent the expenditure of the money, no doubt about that, if it were agreed to, which I suppose it will not be.

Mr. MADDEN. Then it would be doing by indirection what you could not do by direction.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Not at all; it is doing it directly. The expenditure of the money shall not be made until a certain thing happens. That might be authorized hereafter. It is a mere limitation unless it authorizes the President to do something which he is not now authorized to do.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I find in a compilation of the Federal Statutes specific authority vested in the President with reference to this very matter. I will read a line or two from the statute. I do not know when it was enacted or in what connection, but it provides:

The President is authorized and requested to invite at an appropriate time, not later than the close of the war in Europe, all the great Governments of the world to send representatives to a conference which shall be charged with the duty of formulating a plan for a court of arbitration or other tribunal to which disputed questions between nations shall be referred for adjudication and peaceful settlement, and to consider the question of disarmament and submit their recommendations to their respective Governments for approval.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the Hensley amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The war in Europe not having closed so far as we are concerned, that seems to be existing law and would empower the President to call a convention of this kind.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That information should be addressed to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has that statute before him.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Two hundred thousand dollars was appropriated for the purpose and made available until the close of the war.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think there was anything in it that limited that provision to the close of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to withdraw his previous ruling, and in view of the discussion upon this point of order and the statute that has been cited the Chair feels that the amendment in the form of a limitation which would withhold the expenditure of \$90,000,000 for increase in the Navy until the President shall invite the nations to send accredited delegates to an international convention to be held in the United States to consider ways and means to bring about a general disarmament is in order.

In 1916, in an appropriation act, there was passed the provision to which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] has referred. The act approved August 29, 1916, gave the President authority to call such a conference not later than the close of the war, and this limitation does withhold the appro-

priation until the conference, which is already authorized, has been called. The Chair was not aware of the existence of that statute and sustained the point of order hastily, but the Chair feels that, although this is a limitation which is very close to a direction, still it is a limitation, that no part of the expenditure shall be made until something which is already authorized to be done is actually done.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair decides, will the Chair hear me a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. While the law referred to in 1916 does provide that the President shall have the power to do a certain thing, within a given time, it does not authorize him to do it.

Mr. DOWELL. Oh, it certainly does, if he has the power.

Mr. MADDEN. He is not directed to do it. There is no provision that he shall do it, and there is no provision for the expense in connection with doing it.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. But \$200,000 was appropriated in 1916 to cover the expenses.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion there, that there is a question whether or not Congress has the power either to direct or authorize the President of the United States to call a diplomatic conference? And I sincerely trust that no utterance of the Chair or any statement on the floor would lead the public to believe that the incoming President would have to get the consent of Congress to call such a conference, or that Congress has to determine what kind of a conference he should call and what machinery he should set up to discharge his duty under the Constitution, so far as foreign affairs are concerned. I think the President of the United States can call a diplomatic conference under whatever name he desires to call it, as the head of our foreign affairs and our sole authorized representative under the Constitution in dealing with other nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the gentleman from Arkansas may have misunderstood him in referring to the act. It is not a directory statute, it is simply an authority, and the President was expected to do that.

Mr. WINGO. That is the point. I think we have the power to request it, and I think the present statute which we have on this question of inhibiting the President from selecting delegates is simply notice that the appropriating branch of the Government would not foot the bill. I think the President can appoint the delegates, but that is notice that we will not foot the bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Chair will read particularly the language to which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] calls attention, in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Brooks]. There seems to be quite a disparity between what is said in the law and what is suggested by the gentleman from Illinois in his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has read the statute, and would be very glad if the gentleman from Michigan would point out any language contained in it which he believes is susceptible of any particular interpretation.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this is a matter of considerable general interest, I think we might as well vote upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that this is a limitation upon a particular appropriation in this bill until the President shall have called a conference which he has been previously authorized and requested to call; but, as the Chair stated awhile ago, the language of the amendment seems to be fairly close to being directory. However, the Chair does not feel that it is a direction, but that it is a limitation on an appropriation, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want simply to make one statement in reference to this amendment. This resolution was introduced January 21 of last year. The Foreign Affairs Committee has reported it out favorably. The only thing it does now is to postpone the expenditure of this amount of money until the President of the United States shall call in conference accredited delegates of all the nations of the world to bring about ways and means of disarmament.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Has the gentleman any information or idea that the incoming President has no intention of calling any such conference?

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. I do not know what the intention of the incoming President is.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Then if the gentleman does not know, is he not placing himself in a position here of trying to force upon the incoming President his own ideas of a foreign policy?

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Not at all.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. As I gather from the amendment, the gentleman does not intend to force any of his ideas upon the incoming President, but he has faith in the assertion of the incoming President that he is going to call such a conference, and he simply offers this to hold the appropriation in abeyance, to see whether the efforts of the incoming President shall fail—not whether he will refuse to do what he has said he is going to do. He will be my President, as he is to be the President of everyone else in these United States, and I think we ought to give full faith and credit to his utterances. I believe he is going to call the conference.

Mr. BARKLEY. And aside from all that, Congress has the right to express its views on this subject, inasmuch as we have to appropriate the money.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe the adoption of the amendment to the bill at this time will, in effect, destroy the progress already made and place the country in a state of doubt before the world in respect to what our policy is. The time has not yet come when America should declare a naval holiday, with all of the preparation for increase in naval facilities. I believe the adoption of such legislation as this would obligate the Government to an expenditure of more money within the next year by way of damages that the Government will be called upon to pay on contracts that will be abrogated or prevented from advancement than the amount of money provided in the bill. No matter what the policy of the Government may be in the future, we ought not to adopt it lightly by the mere insertion of an amendment of this kind in an appropriation bill. We should give consideration to the Government's obligations under its contracts. We should let the world understand that while we are willing to meet them in any conference for a cessation of naval increase, we are still bound under the program which we have already entered into and under the contracts that we have already made; that we are not willing to enter into any conference with anybody for a reduction of our naval facilities until our program is complete.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I am for the completion of the program. Then after we have done that—cleaned up the obligations which the program involves—I would be perfectly willing to confer, but with a lot of unfinished ships that might be thrown into the wastebasket as a result of the conference it does not meet my approval, and I am opposed to the amendment, and I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Brooks]. We have been avowing for a long while that we are really in favor of disarmament. In the present condition of the world we have an excellent opportunity to demonstrate whether we are or whether we are not. As far as I am concerned, my position is that unless the other nations of the earth agree to limit armaments our national interests absolutely require that we continue to build a great Navy, a Navy sufficient to meet any possible enemy on the high seas. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois does not limit the expenditure of this building appropriation, except to the extent that it provides that it shall not be expended until the President of the United States calls an international conference on disarmament. The moment the President issues the invitation to foreign nations to participate in such a conference the money becomes available for expenditure. It seems to me that those facts would be one of the most eloquent arguments to the other nations of the world. We will by this action say to them "We are willing to disarm if you are, and if you are not willing to disarm then we shall continue on our building program of 1916, and if you enter into competition with us in the building of a Navy we will pledge our resources to build one that will excel that of any nation in the world. If you are willing to disarm, if you mean what you say, if you are willing to devote some of your resources to the development of the industries of peace instead of preparing for war, this great Nation that has emerged from the greatest struggle that ever shook the foundations of the earth practically unimpaired, practically the only great Nation that can look into the future

and, shaking the tears of suffering from war from her eyes, know that her future is secure—if you will agree with us to disarm, we shall meet you half way, but unless you do we shall continue to build the greatest Navy that shall ride upon the seven seas."

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman think we would be in a better strategic position to secure disarmament by taking this action now rather than to go ahead with the program and let the conference be called afterwards—

Mr. CONNALLY. After when?

Mr. FESS. As soon as the President will be able to call it.

Mr. CONNALLY. He will be able to call it in 20 minutes after he makes up his mind.

Mr. FESS. I have great sympathy with what the gentleman is saying. I want him to understand that, but the question with me is whether, if our Navy is disarmed, we are in a better position to reach it by taking this step now than to go on?

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman misses my point. My point is that we shall let the President issue his proclamation, and after he has issued it the money then becomes available. Let the navy yards and agencies of the Navy Department go right on with the building program, and by that action itself say to the nations of the world that we are not going to stop building battleships until they do. That would be more persuasive than all polite pourparlers and diplomatic exchange of courtesies. I believe in making that known not only by words but by deeds; that if they want to compete with us and will not disarm, that we accept the gage of battle and will proceed to build the greatest navy the world has ever seen.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman will permit, as the fact is that this appropriation does not become available until July 1, the incoming President would be able to call a conference to meet without any suspension whatever?

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree, of course, I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky, this appropriation will not become available until the 1st of July, 1921. The incoming President will have from March until July to decide whether he desires to call this conference, and the moment he calls it the appropriation becomes available. It does not provide that no part of the sum shall be expended until the conference convenes, but that no part shall be available until the President issues the invitation.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will.

Mr. LAZARO. I would like to ask the gentleman if that was not the point that appealed to Senator BORAH more than anything else—

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not able to answer the gentleman, because I have not read Senator BORAH's statement on the subject.

Mr. LAZARO. In his advocacy of suspension, his attention was called to the fact that if we took care of ourselves and completed our armament that then we would be not only in a position to suggest but to command disarmament, and he admitted that was the soundest argument advanced.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I am sure it would appeal to Senator BORAH, because he is a very intelligent and able gentleman, and I hope it will be possible for Senator BORAH to appeal successfully to some of his colleagues across the aisle, or rather some of his political colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would be glad to yield to my old-time school—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. I want to say to the gentleman that I can conceive that some time after the 4th of March the world's condition might suddenly change so that war might be threatened; that the international situation might suddenly change so that it might be very unwise for the President to issue the proclamation, and if that condition should, unfortunately, arise, then this money could not be made available with which to go ahead with the work. What does the gentleman say to that?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the gentleman that when the nations of the earth are about to engage in a war it would be the best possible time, it seems to me, to ask them to disarm.

If the gentleman really wants to prevent war, I will say that the best time to disarm a bully is when he is about to do some damage. All of these years we have been praying for peace and disarmament, but we have definitely done nothing about it.

Mr. DENISON. But the gentleman does not really think if a great war was threatened it could be put aside by simply sending an invitation to disarm? I am sure the gentleman from Texas would not contend that a nation could properly prevent war, where war is threatened, by sending an invitation to the hostile nation asking it to consider a proposition of disarmament?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would ask the gentleman what great nation he has in mind now that is about to start a great world war between now and the 1st of July?

Mr. DENISON. I do not know that there is any great nation that will do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the hypothesis the gentleman's question is based on.

Mr. DENISON. I am stating a proposition that might arise.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a mere possibility.

Mr. DENISON. I do not know what the situation with Japan might be, but I do think there is great danger of hostilities arising between this country and Japan.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the gentleman that in such an event this appropriation will be available the next moment. I can see no inconsistency in that action. When we invite the nations of the world to this conference we should let them know that we are inviting them to something more than a pink tea, more than a mere philosophical discussion of the beauties of peace. We should let them know when we invite them that while we want peace, and desire peace, and desire limitation of armaments, unless they are willing to join us in limiting armaments we are going to build a great navy, ample to protect our interests. And that is the only kind of argument that will appeal to some of the nations of the world. They are quite willing for us to disarm if we do not prevent them from arming. They are perfectly willing for us to take a naval holiday if at the same time they are permitted to go ahead and build a great fleet. I believe now is the time for the United States to embrace this opportunity, and let them know once and for all that if they want disarmament we will join with them, but, if not, they must compete with us in the building of the greatest navy that floats upon the sea.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree upon the amount of time necessary to finish this. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be closed in an hour and thirty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph close in 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if there is to be a division of the time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I had thought of leaving it to the Chair, but division of the time might be better.

Mr. AYRES. How is that?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Unless the Chair has some preference, I would be perfectly willing to leave it to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] and the other half by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] and one-half by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that that would be making an equitable division of the time, because this is a proposition where two respective sides ought to have an equal division of the time, those for and those against, rather than the two sides of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is what I was trying to fix, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman did not object to my request?

Mr. BLANTON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to fixing the time on this amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] asks for the time on this amendment. Is that the understanding of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated the request to include the pending paragraph with amendments thereto.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; that was not the request of the gentleman from Michigan. The request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], as I understood it, was that all debate on this amendment close in 1 hour and 30 minutes from now.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman has said that I am correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, in view of the statement of the gentleman that made the request and the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, the Chair will state that the debate has been limited on the pending amendment. It does not include further amendments to the paragraph which have been read.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan rose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent that the hour and a half be controlled jointly by myself and by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and one-half by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand how anyone who really favors international disarmament can be opposed to this amendment. I can well understand how some gentlemen who have no abiding faith that other nations will keep their agreements might be opposed to any plan for international disarmament. But this amendment simply asks that we extend an invitation to the other nations to join in a discussion or convention to consider such a program. It is absolutely the very least we can do to show that we are acting in good faith when we talk about disarmament. Can other nations be expected to believe that we are in good faith when we talk here about international disarmament when all that we do is to appropriate for the largest navy, the most powerful that will be upon the surface of the globe when it is completed? How can we expect them to have any faith in us if we have not at least faith enough in them to invite them to discuss this proposition?

Now, Mr. Chairman, as has been well said, the money that is to be expended by this appropriation will not be paid out until after the 1st of July. There is already money enough to carry on these operations beyond that date, leaving a small balance for some days thereafter.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question to me?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In what position does the gentleman think it would put the President of the United States after he had called this conference to which the gentleman refers if he permitted the construction to go forward under this bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; to cease building under those circumstances?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It would put him into a position of proposing to cease construction which he can not do now. That is where it would place him with the support of Congress, just exactly where he ought to be and where I think he would wish to be.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What would be his answer to those who say, "Why go ahead with these ships?"

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Such a treaty, when made, would be the law of the land and it would supersede this law.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is arguing that there would be no suspension?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; I am not arguing anything of the kind. Gentlemen anticipate, of course, and I anticipate, of course, that this convention would last for some time. There would be no suspension unless an agreement was made.

Now, I can not yield further, even to my distinguished friend from Michigan. I want to comment upon some of the remarks which he made. The gentleman told you a few days ago that there would be some expense in stopping work on the *Massachusetts*, which is the least advanced of all these ships. What the gentleman meant was that work on it had progressed the least of all the battleships. Some of the battle cruisers and even some of the battleships are not much more advanced than 1 per cent of construction. I doubt whether they have in gen-

eral made anything more than the mere plans. The keels have not been laid. I see no reason why we should stop these ships if the appropriations were reduced. Gentlemen say the expense that will result from stopping these plans will be greater than the expense we would incur if we proceeded with them. What profits have they provided for in these contracts that gentlemen think will cause so much damage if they are canceled? Gentlemen can not, of course, mean that. They talk as though contracts have been made in advance of the appropriations. Have they been? If they have, the officials of the department have exceeded their powers under the law and they have done something that they had no right to do. Here are these battle cruisers, upon which almost nothing has been done, less by far than was done on the three battleships of England corresponding with the *Hood* when England took them from the ways and scrapped them entirely, and nobody ever heard of any great loss resulting, beyond the loss of the material, when those vessels were scrapped. That was the situation with reference to this matter.

We might very well, as I think, have reduced this appropriation very much further. But I can not tell, and I doubt if any gentleman can tell, at just what point we must stop, except as provided by this amendment, which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] and which I think ought to be adopted. As it stands at present, we talk about disarmament, but when it comes to taking any action leading to disarmament we do nothing, and to reject this amendment is notice upon the other nations that we will refuse to do anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] is recognized.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and will as briefly as possible state my reasons therefor. I believe the amendment to be unwise, because if it be a limitation upon the expenditure of this money, then the expenditure thereof is entirely dependent upon the action of the Executive. It remains with him to determine whether or not he will call this conference, and if he chooses not to call this conference, then the money is not to be expended.

That, in my judgment, is not the part of wisdom. Either this money should be appropriated and expended, or such portion thereof as may be necessary, or it should not be appropriated at all. But in no event should the appropriation be dependent on the Executive authority of the Government.

In the next place, if it be a direction to the President of the United States to call the conference, then clearly it is legislation and has no right in this bill. Therefore upon these two grounds, stated as succinctly as I can state them, without further argument I am against this amendment.

But, now, let us see further as to the wisdom of this appropriation. I was informed by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs a few moments ago that in order to complete the program of 1916 there would be required an expenditure of over \$340,000,000, and possibly reaching the sum of \$360,000,000. When I first came to this House I heard of "little Navy men" and then again I heard of "big Navy men." What I would like to hear of now, and what I hope we all are, is patriotic Navy men. I believe implicitly that some one must take the lead in this idea of disarmament. I believe that America should be first; first not only in war, as some people have declared that it should be, but first in the movement for peace. [Applause.] This proposition of going toward the establishment either of a conference—or a disarmament conference, if you please—is a step in the right direction.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DEWALT. I will.

Mr. DOWELL. Does not the gentleman believe, if this amendment is adopted, that America will take the lead?

Mr. DEWALT. That, again, is problematical. I do not believe that the adoption of this amendment would affect the matter one way or the other. I do believe, however, that the objection I have made to it with regard to the resting of authority on that proposition entirely with the Executive by reason of the disposition of this sum of money is entirely sound, not only from the tactical standpoint but from the legal and legislative standpoint.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWALT. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. If it will not affect the proposition one way or the other it can do no harm, can it?

Mr. DEWALT. It may do no harm, except that, in my judgment, it establishes a wrongful precedent, and wrong precedents always do harm.

Now, coming back again to what I was endeavoring to say, it has been estimated that this World War cost a total sum of \$348,000,000,000, not alone in the expenditure of money but in the loss of productive power throughout the world. We know that it cost us \$23,000,000,000. We know that it cost us 86,000 lives. We know that it cost us 250,000 wounded men; and it seems to me that the Congress of the United States, in tending toward peace, in tending toward that great precept that we learned at our mothers' knees, "Peace on earth, good will to men," should say that now is the time for America to declare that we will take the lead in this direction. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEWALT. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the time has been fixed.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I rise in favor of the amendment. The reduction of armament is the greatest issue not only in the United States of America but in the whole world. The people of this country and of the world desire peace and a reduction of armaments, and we have now an opportunity to vote in favor of calling a conference to consider the whole question of limiting armaments. I believe that I speak the viewpoint of all those soldiers who went over on the other side when I say that the paramount issue is the reduction of the armaments of the world, both military and naval, and we can not take a better step in the right direction than by passing this amendment and putting the stamp of our approval on the proposition. This whole question is a practical one and not an academic one. If the President elect calls into conference the best minds of the world, the representatives of the great nations of the world, they can get together around a table and come to an agreement to reduce the armaments of the world. Consider for a minute the position in which we now are. Our Navy is two and one-half times that of Japan. Our proposed building program is two and a half times that of Japan; our Navy is slightly smaller than that of England; and at that conference England, owing us some \$4,000,000,000, we can say to Great Britain, "We will disarm proportionately, and that proportion will be ton for ton and ship for ship and man for man with yours." We can pay off a part of that debt, if necessary, to make up for the existing differential, where England now has a few more ships than ours.

It can do not harm to pass this amendment and give the President elect the opportunity which this country wants, which the whole country wants, to bring about a conference on this question immediately. So far as the Military Establishment is concerned, it would be an equally easy matter to agree on a plan of limitation. The gentlemen on that side of the House talk about a League of Nations.

The people by a majority of 7,000,000 votes have decided against the League of Nations, against surrendering the sovereignty of this country to a supergovernment, but the people are unanimous on the question of disarmament. The people would vote unanimously for proportional reduction of the navies of the world. If I had my way and could write a league of nations, I would write it in one paragraph, and provide that no army in the world shall be more than 200,000 men with enlistment not less than two years, that there shall not be more than a certain amount of munitions of war produced by any country and none by private concerns, and that there shall be an impartial investigating commission to see that these limitations are enforced. The same plan could be agreed upon for the navies of the world. We can limit the navies; we can limit the size of the ships and the size of the guns.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I have not the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FISH. We can bring about a large reduction of armaments, both of the naval and military establishments, quickly and without difficulty if the principal representatives of the great powers are simply asked to come here to the United States and consider the question, as they all have the same objective in view.

I hope the amendment will prevail. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the business of manufacturing war munitions is not the only interest that prevents this Nation from making a start toward disarmament. If steel found its market only in a merchant marine, which means a constructive program, if it found its market only in the sale of steel rails for railroads, which means also a constructive peace-time program, the steel industry could not declare the big dividends that it annually returns to its stockholders. So it must continue

to impose upon the country a war-time program of destructiveness. We found this exemplified in the Army bill and we are finding it exemplified in this Navy bill. Our good friends over on this side of the aisle as their only excuse for continuing this \$900,000,000 naval program say that since the armistice six new keels have been laid for battle cruisers. I want to call attention to the fact that my good Republican friends across the aisle have been in power in this House since April 19, 1919, nearly two whole years. You have had a majority of 47 Members in this House for nearly two whole years. You came into power on April 19, 1919, with the promise and the pledge of giving the country a constructive program leading to disarmament, a peace-time program. There is no excuse for the fact that since April, 1919, six new keels have been laid. Why did you not do something during these two years to stop the laying of those keels? If you had done even that, this expenditure of \$90,000,000 in this bill for new construction would not be necessary.

I want to say right now that if, as contended by distinguished members of this committee, we could have saved \$20,000,000 by waiting from last year to this, and could save \$15,000,000 by waiting from this year until next for construction, why could we not have saved that whole \$35,000,000 by putting it off until next year? But it is your appropriation bills that you have brought in here during the last two years that have caused this big \$900,000,000 naval program to continue.

The only chance on earth to stop it is to proceed along the line of this amendment. You have got to make a beginning at some time. I believe if our country would take the lead, if it had the courage to take the lead, and would begin the disarmament, as was said here on the floor the other day, the public sentiment of the peoples of the other nations of the world would compel other nations to follow our example. I believe we ought to take that stand. We ought to show the country that we are willing to disarm. I come from a country where men used to carry a .45 in their hip pocket all the time, but they do not do it now. They have learned better; they have learned that when they had the .45's they were sure to get into trouble sometime when they went out among their fellow-men. If you want to keep out of trouble, keep the arms off. We have got to come to disarmament some time, and I hope we will take the first step by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, when Gen. Bliss, the soldier, the statesman, and the scholar, appeared before our Naval Affairs Committee a week or so ago, in reference to the matter of reduction or curtailing of armaments, he made this significant statement: He said if this question was submitted to the peoples of the world under a free plebiscite there would be an overwhelming verdict in favor of the curtailment of armament. I believe Gen. Bliss was correct. I am in hearty sympathy with any movement which will look toward the reduction of the armed forces of the earth, and a lessening of the burden of taxation caused by preparation for war. I think there can be no question in the minds of civilization that the time has come when the world should make every effort to bring about some understanding among the nations on this vital subject. I welcome the dawn of that day when the disputes between nations may be settled by some other means rather than the arbitrament of arms, distant through that day may be. I believe America stands predominant to-day among the nations which should take the lead in this forward step of reduction of military forces. We are the greatest to-day in resources and in man power, and we occupy the position of being free from the jealousies of Old World feuds and disputes. Thus the nations would know that our lead was not for selfish purposes or actuated by sinister motives. We are in an enviable position, and I believe the time has come when we should make the effort, but I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, in tying the hands of the incoming President by inserting this provision in the naval bill. I am willing to trust Senator Harding. He is a man of vision. He is a man imbued with noble ideals. He has the highest conception of the obligations of humanity in its sweep onward to loftier planes. I believe his hands should be free to act when and where he sees fit to bring about this conference. I do not believe in attaching a world movement to an appropriation bill and making such a subject dependent upon Executive action in relation to a supply measure. For these reasons I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. [Applause.]

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is a matter for congratulation to me and my party to see how tenaciously the Republican Party clings to legislative enactments of the Democratic Party. [Laughter.] This

building program, Democratic in origin, has become sacred—I take it, not so much for the real merits of the legislation as from the source from which it came.

But, honestly, if we do believe in a limitation of armament, I am curious to know what logic impels one to say that he wants a limitation of armament and yet vote to continue the building of battleships. If you are to have a limitation of armament as the result of international agreement and you have the battleships, the limitation will decree that you shall dispose of them, and your money is gone. You would be infinitely better off to suspend the building program until it is known definitely whether the world is going to agree with you about the limitation of armament.

But I know as well as I know that I stand here, that any man in this House who pretends to be doubtful of the result of an international agreement is either trying to deceive himself or to deceive other Members of the House, and possibly both. There is not a nation on this earth now that can afford to reject a plan for the limitation of armament. We all know that. There are but two or three countries on earth which are not bankrupt now. All the leading nations, nearly, are so heavily indebted to us that if we should demand the payment of the money we loaned them we could curtail their building program, and you know it. We know that England wants an agreement to limit armament; we know that Japan has said that she wants an agreement to limit armament. I know that if Japan is not honest about it she could be compelled to assent to it because of the peculiar situation of Japan. She is not in a position to withstand pressure from the other great nations on earth—being absolutely unable to feed her population she is bound to accept, and I think would be glad to accept the limitation of armament.

It looks to me like criminal folly—it is more than that, it is a crime—whenever there is an opportunity offered a nation to engage with other nations of the world in a conference with a view to limit armament, and thus lift from the backs of the taxpayers of the world some of the burdens under which they are staggering—it is a crime to reject any proposition that might lead to the limitation of armament, the reduction of preparation to murder.

My good friend from Pennsylvania, for whom I have great respect [Mr. DEWALT], said a moment ago that this amendment would do neither good nor harm. If he believes that he ought not to take up the time of the House in debating it. If it has no possibility either of good or evil no man ought to take up the time of the House to discuss it. My friend from Illinois, who fears that war may arise between the 4th of March and the 30th of June, and that this amendment might cripple the country in making preparation to wage this war, expressed but little confidence in the incoming administration. God bless you, everybody—no; I will take that back—but nearly everybody knows that through lack of thought on the part of the voters last November the Republican Party will come into absolute control of every branch of the Government on the 4th of March.

If this amendment hinders or delays this Government in getting ready for any emergency you have the President, and you will have the House here by such a big majority that you will have to count them every morning to see that you have not lost some of them, and God be praised if you lose all of them. [Laughter.] You have the Senate, and you can repeal this amendment if it is hindering, crippling, or delaying this country in getting ready to meet a great emergency. You have said that you want to have international disarmament. If you really mean it, why hesitate to vote for an amendment which simply says that until the President of these United States shall call an international conference no part of the appropriation shall be available for a continuation of the building program. That is all it says. He can call that conference on the 4th of March, and every dollar of this appropriation will be available immediately, although you can not expend it until the 1st of July, 1921. By voting for it we will not only say to the other nations of the earth, but to the incoming President of the United States, that we are in favor of international disarmament. You people denounce the outgoing President for wanting to absorb and assert all of the rights, both executive and legislative, and all we do by this amendment is to advise the incoming administration that the American Congress is in favor of international disarmament. That we believe right and justice can and should rule the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I did not mean by the question I propounded to one of the gentlemen awhile ago that I thought a cause of war would arise before the 1st of July, for,

of course, I do not, and I do not think the gentleman from Arkansas understood me to mean that.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then what did the gentleman mean, if he meant anything?

Mr. DENISON. I think I can explain it to the gentleman.

Mr. CARAWAY. It needs explanation.

Mr. DENISON. I said that I could conceive of the international situation becoming such before the 1st of July that it would not be prudent or wise for our President to call such a conference, and I think so now. Nearly all of the remarks that have been made upon this amendment have been on the ultimate question of the wisdom or desirability of disarmament. I think there is no great deal of difference of opinion among the Members of the House or among the statesmen of the world with respect to the desirability of disarmament. That is not the question that is involved in this amendment. A very different question is involved.

I think we all practically agree upon that question. I think the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] expressed the sentiment of nearly all of us, that we all want to see the time come soon when nations will stop expending their treasure for increasing armament. The question, however, that this amendment presents is whether or not, when we are making a naval appropriation which the Appropriations Committee has found to be necessary as a matter of economy and as a matter of prudence, the House shall attach to it a ridiculous limitation. I say, if we approve this amendment and impose this limitation upon the President of our country under present world conditions we will be making ourselves ridiculous. If we want to pass a resolution expressing the sentiment of the House of Representatives upon this subject of disarmament, if we want to put it even in the form of a suggestion or a request to our President that he call such an international conference, let us go about it in the regular way and pass such a resolution. In that form I would gladly vote for it. But let us not impose the necessity upon the President of doing so, regardless of his judgment as to the propriety or the manner that he should follow in calling such a conference. Let us go ahead now and complete the expenditures that are necessary in our naval program. If we should be so unwise as to pass this amendment and it should become a law, the world would know when the President called the conference that he was simply calling it as a matter of necessity and not because he was seriously in favor of such a proceeding.

Mr. TINCHER. But the world would not have any question in respect to the American Congress being seriously in favor of it. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman from Kansas knows that the American Congress can let its views be known by a proper proceeding for that purpose rather than by a limitation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; certainly I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the gentleman mean to say that the President is not in sympathy with disarmament?

Mr. DENISON. I think he is in sympathy with it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does the gentleman say that the nations of the world would assume that he was calling it because he had to and did not mean it?

Mr. DENISON. Because by this action we will have clearly undertaken to make him do it. The matter of calling an international disarmament conference is a matter of foreign policy. I think the President ought to be left to his own discretion as to the time and manner of calling such a conference as well as the purposes for which it is called.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the membership of the House are perhaps not very familiar with hearings which the House Naval Committee have had on this question, and I can but feel, in the light of such hearings, that it would be improper to pass this amendment. The House committee has had extended hearings on this subject, and are informed through such hearings that practically the unanimous sentiment of our people favors an international conference looking to a limitation of armaments. The chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, whom every Member on both sides of the aisle respects, went to Ohio and interviewed the President elect in reference to this and other matters, and on his return announced to our committee, and to the press as well, that the President elect was in hearty sympathy with such public sentiment as disclosed by the committee's hearings, and further

stated that it was the intention of the President elect to call an international conference of this kind at an early date after March 4.

Mr. CARAWAY. If that is the view of the incoming President, he certainly would not object to finding Congress in hearty sympathy with him.

Mr. OLIVER. The answer to that is this, that it would be indeed a lack of faith shown by Congress as to the sincerity of the President if we should undertake now to say that we will make this appropriation dependent on the President elect keeping faith with his public announcement. I have confidence in the statement which the President made to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and which he has since made to the country through the press. Certainly it does not comport with propriety at this time for any Member of the House to question the sincerity of the President in that respect.

Mr. LAYTON. Of course, there is no man in the House who is going to do that; but I want to propound this query: Does the gentleman not think that some sort of expression from this great body that represents the entire American people would strengthen the hand of our President and give notice to the whole world that we believe in it? [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER. The sentiment of the country is unquestionably in favor of an international conference. I think every Member of this Congress is in favor of such a conference. We have taken what I believe to be proper steps to ascertain such fact, and the chairman of the House Naval Committee interviewed the President elect in order to secure his views. Now, since he has been so frank as to announce his views, I wonder why this House feels called upon to seemingly compel him to do what he has announced are his purposes and desires. I think, from another viewpoint, you will recognize the impropriety of the amendment. You favor a limitation of armament, and yet you here in this amendment undertake to appropriate \$90,000,000 to build a great Navy, yet hold up the expenditure of the sum only until a conference is called to consider the question of disarmament, and when such conference is called the \$90,000,000 is immediately available.

Mr. BUTLER. And then go to building.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; then at once resume building, if you please.

Mr. LAYTON. I think that is a defect in the resolution.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly it is inconsistent in itself. If you are not in favor of appropriating \$90,000,000 to continue the construction of a program ordered in 1916, have the courage to say so; but do not undertake, when the President has already announced his intention, to seek, if you please to pose as the lone friends of disarmament, and yet when the President calls the conference then make available at once the \$90,000,000 to build up a Navy. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe any Member of this House can more earnestly hope for the adoption of a disarmament plan than I do. I have spent a quarter of a century helping to build up this great military force, and I want in my last days to see the safety period reached when at least a part of it can be taken down. With this longing desire within me, I would not embarrass the next President of the United States by trying to impose a condition upon him without even a consultation with him and surely not in advance of his inauguration. It has been said by my esteemed colleague from Alabama that I made the statement some time ago that a conference of the nations of the world would be called, the purpose of which would be to seek disarmament in part. No reasonable man living can expect total disarmament, and in my judgment it would be undesirable. Let us strive for those things attainable. The difficulty with this resolution, in my judgment, is well stated by the gentleman from Alabama. He and I usually see alike on subjects submitted to us for consideration; therefore he can have no objection to my indorsement of his statement. We provide by the proposed amendment for the suspension of construction before the conference is summoned and then immediately resume the construction when the summons is issued. Think of the spectacle presented here. Invite the nations to assemble for peaceful purposes and send with the invitation a notice that their representatives will find us engaged loading our guns when they arrive. In short, begin the loading after the peace conference is summoned. I can not vote for this bill with such an amendment added to it.

Let me say this now and here. I am not the keeper of the secret of any man. No man has commissioned me to speak for him, but notwithstanding this, I have the hope within me—indeed, it is not a hope, but a conviction—that before the next harvest time in Pennsylvania, or the next cotton picking in the South, this conference demanded by thinking civilization will

be in session somewhere, the purpose of which, in part, will be to reduce and fix world armaments. Where is there a man who will not agree with me in the statement that of all things to be desired this is the most desirable? [Applause.] If the resolution of the gentleman from Illinois, which is now upon the calendar, should be brought up in this House, I am willing to vote for it, but I am not willing, as I said in advance, to say to the people of the world, "We will cease building while we are not talking, but immediately resume with the beginning of friendly conversation," and then hold up before their eyes \$90,000,000 especially provided. That does not seem to me to be the right and sensible sort of thing to do. I do not know how they will ever—

Mr. UPshaw rose.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman knows I desire to yield, but I can not. The only time that real opportunity for armament limitation has been given since Christ was upon the earth is about to appear because of our impoverished condition. We are too poor to make war and sustain armaments for that purpose alone. As long as men have both vanity and fattened pocketbooks they can afford to gratify the latter, but when they grow poor their vanity will at least be concealed. These great armaments that constantly threaten the peace of the world ought to be reduced to a size where they will furnish the needs of the State alone. We have learned, as the gentleman from Alabama has said, about their cost, and there can be no doubt that the people of the world demand that these should be reduced, and no monarch or ruler can stand against it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes and that it be not taken out of the hour and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson]. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield for that purpose?

Mr. Sisson. I will yield if it does not come out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be taken out of the gentleman's time. He will be recognized. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for five additional minutes notwithstanding the previous order fixing debate and such time to be in addition to the time fixed in that order. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I very greatly appreciate this special privilege secured for me by my reliable friend. Perhaps in the first line you will permit me to say that one reason why the desire for peaceful solution is so strong within me grows out of the expressed religious views of my ancestors upon the settlement of differences by the application of force. I would live to see the time when the nations can find some other method by which they can settle their differences, and this because it is right. Another great war within the present generation and civilization will likely fall and nations never again respect their obligations. Men would no longer remain obedient, and every man would become a law unto himself.

I feel with great confidence that this will not be the only proposal the nations will be asked to consider, and therefore I have doubt whether this amendment, if adopted, would confine the President of the United States to one proposal alone in order to make these appropriations effective. I do believe, and, indeed, I feel that I know, that this will not be the only proposal that will be made, but that the nations will be asked to assemble for several purposes, and that this will be one of them. When the invitation shall be issued and the proposals contained and the place of meeting, I do not know, but the amendment provides that this assemblage shall be within the United States. Suppose the President of the United States should be unable to secure the meeting in the United States, what will be the effect of the amendment upon the appropriation? Do not let us take a step backward; do not let us look back. Never mind what was the thought of the people at the last election. There were various reasons that controlled and influenced them. This may have been one of them, but it has been in the minds of all men and all thinking people that the time to make a successful attempt is at hand, and we should never for one minute or one hour lessen our attempt or impose conditions which might endanger success.

Now, my friends, I recall when President Wilson telegraphed us from abroad that he wanted 10 battleships added to the annual naval bill. I doubted the wisdom of it, but he was President and he was striving for peace, and I would not dare in any way to jeopardize his success. So I sank my own views upon the necessity for the request and voted to give the Presi-

dent his own way. Are you willing to do as much here? Are you willing, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] has so well said, to force or tie his hand with an embarrassing condition? Do not do it, my friends. Let it be with the Executive the same as we did two years ago.

No; do not take the exclusive authority from the President. Let him have the undertaking his own way. Let him be responsible for the time and place of the convention and for the different subjects which the delegates will be called to discuss, but do not, my friends, I beg of you, tie a President's willing hands with this condition which is bound to be offensive to a nation willing to live in peace with its neighbors. I repeat, that I will cheerfully vote for the resolution of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but am unwilling to vote for the amendment which he proposes here. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in my judgment you are not getting anywhere toward peace or disarmament by this sort of a resolution. You simply tie up this particular appropriation. I do not think it is even a mere speck on the sky.

Personally I believe in disarmament; personally I believe that war is the most savage thing that civilized men can engage in. I not only believe that, but I believe the most cruel thing that human beings can do is to go into the slaughtering business. I do not believe that war settles things right. It is usually not on the side of right, but on the side of might and, as Napoleon said, with the biggest guns and the most guns.

I do not believe you are going to bring about peace in the world until you take profit out of war making. As long as men can make great fortunes in the preparation for war there is going to be around the capitals of the world these men who endeavor to get up all sorts of schemes to justify appropriations for big war measures. They play one nation against another. They played us against Japan at one time until that played out, and then they played us against Germany. And so it goes on. Why? Because there are many millions of dollars of profit in war, and while I do not believe in many of David Starr Jordan's expressions about war, I believe that he told the truth when he said the way to stop war is to take the profit out of making war materials, out of the manufacture of steel plates, and out of the manufacture of guns and munitions. As long as these profits go to people and furnish millions of men with employment, just so long you are going to have desires for war or for preparations for war.

It has been said that there have been more millionaires created within the last few years, since this last war commenced, than were created during the entire time since the Civil War and up to the World War. Whether that is true or not I do not know; but I believe that this is a very puny way of endeavoring to get at it. In the first place, the President ought to veto such a bill as this. He ought to say, "I am not going to be limited in my judgment of international affairs; I am vested by the Constitution with the power of negotiating treaties, untrammelled either by the House or the Senate." In my judgment, we are trespassing upon all the prerogatives of the President. And I want to tell you that I am one of the few people who are afraid of trespassing upon the prerogatives of the Executive, not only that we may preserve the executive branch, but the legislative branch as well.

And I will say this of the present President of the United States and of the future President of the United States—I did not elect the latter or help to elect him—that they will endeavor to comply with the constitutional provision. When the President does that I do not want that constitutional prerogative of his interfered with in the least to begin to negotiate treaties in any manner in which he may see fit. If this was a resolution that got anywhere, I would not hesitate for one minute to vote for it, but if you put one limitation on one item in one appropriation bill for the purpose of affecting the President's prerogative, the chances are you will get the bill vetoed by the present President of the United States. Of course, I do not know that he will veto it, but the chances are that he will. Another chance will be that it will not go through the Senate. So you are not getting anywhere by putting it in the bill. Nor do I believe that this is the right way to get at it, and for that reason I shall vote against it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I hope and long for the time when the nations of the world can agree to some sort of a disarmament program. The substance of the amendment which has just been offered, and which is now under discussion, came up before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member; hearings

were conducted thereon, and the resolution embodying those ideas of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] was favorably reported out of that committee without a dissenting vote, as I recall it. But it is one thing to be in favor of a plan providing for a conference for a joint disarmament as a separate and distinct proposition, and it is another thing to have such a plan attached as a proviso or rider to an item in an appropriation act.

The bill under discussion here appropriates several millions of dollars going toward the completion of a naval program commenced in the year 1916. The question to me is: Are we for or against a gradual completion of the 1916 naval program? In my judgment we should complete that program until there is some plan or method devised whereby joint disarmament can be agreed upon by the nations.

We are asked by the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] to insert a limitation providing that no part of this money shall be used until the President of the United States shall have called a conference of the nations, to be held in America, for the purpose of discussing disarmament. This limitation is an intimation that the President elect is not in sympathy with the disarmament program, that he does not intend to follow out the authorization that was conferred upon the President of the United States as far back as August, 1916. This is not the fact. On the other hand, the contrary is true.

The incoming administration is confronted with monumental problems. The President elect will need the support of all. He has shown every willingness to receive the ideas of every citizen regardless of party in an endeavor to solve both foreign and domestic questions. Disarmament is only one of several methods in an attempt to prevent war and to maintain peace. The incoming President has announced himself in favor of the principle of joint disarmament. I have confidence in his desire to call such a conference unless something now unforeseen would make it inadvisable and against our best interests to do so.

I am not willing to tie his hands. I am not willing to force him to adopt this plan regardless of future conditions at the penalty of being deprived of the \$90,000,000 necessary to go ahead with our 1916 naval program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota yields back two minutes. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be exceedingly unwise to adopt this amendment. Gentlemen have called attention to the fact that if, in pursuance of this amendment, the President should call a conference, immediately upon the conference assembling in the city of Washington we would then proceed with the construction of these ships. Now, the other side to the proposition is equally objectionable to me. If he does not call the conference, then we will need the ships, and under this amendment we will be unable to complete the construction of the ships authorized by this 1916 program.

Now, what would be the result if the President of the United States did not call this conference before July 1? Some shipyards in this country at this time are engaged almost exclusively in the construction of battleships authorized under this program. The suspension of this program even for a few weeks would cause claims for damages running up into millions of dollars before we got through against the Government of the United States.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. Admiral Taylor, the Chief of the Bureau of Construction, was asked the question, "What would be the loss or damage if they held up two of the battleships that were least advanced?" And he said, "Not less than \$10,000,000 each, and perhaps on the second one \$11,000,000." That is \$21,000,000 on 2 battleships alone, and this problem involves 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, and other vessels.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is undoubtedly true. One gentleman stated a while ago he would not oppose an expression of opinion. This is not an expression of opinion. It is wielding a big stick over the head of the next President. He is told that he must do certain things or else the responsibility will be upon him of scrapping the Navy. I am not willing to have Congress adopt this attitude toward the President elect, and I am not willing to give him that authority, in case he does not call this conference, to scrap the Navy.

Another thing, the President elect has not stated, as I am informed, that he is opposed to entering the League of Nations on terms or reservations satisfactory to his party. This reso-

lution, if passed, would scrap the League of Nations so far as the President is concerned. It would demand that the President summon the nations of the earth to Washington in conference only on the subject of disarmament. I want to leave it to the President of the United States to decide, when he is inaugurated on March 4, whether he will advocate entering the League of Nations or endeavor to bring about a new association of nations for the accomplishment of the same purpose, the peace of the world. President Wilson has had the authority to invite the nations into a conference for disarmament and has not done so, because he provided for disarmament in the treaty of Versailles.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret I can not yield.

I do not want to see the President usurp the powers of the legislative branch of our Government, and I do not want this legislative department of the Government to usurp the powers of the Executive, even before he is inaugurated in office.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that there is a law which prohibits the President calling an international conference unless it is first authorized by law?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I heard gentlemen argue that this was a limitation and did not authorize the President to call a conference, and they contended that he already had the necessary authority.

Mr. CONNALLY. He has authority to call this kind of a conference, or would have, if this were adopted; but there is a statute on the books prohibiting the President from calling any international conference except where it is specifically authorized, so that this is the only kind of a conference that he can call, and the gentleman is opposed to his calling it?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No. What I want to see the President of the United States do is to enter the League of Nations. It is the only proposition that has been made that makes a forward step toward the peaceable settlement of disputes between nations. This amendment would declare that the Congress is opposed to his entering the League of Nations and wants him to call a conference of the nations at Washington for the purpose of considering one question, which is only one of the many questions involved in the League of Nations. I want him to be free to advocate that this Nation enter the League of Nations, which is the only forward step that has been taken to bring about peace on earth. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, waiving aside for the moment the wisdom of doing the thing that the proponent of the amendment has in mind, I think it would be very unfortunate to adopt the amendment under the circumstances. Whether it is a direction in language to the President or not, technically speaking, nobody can question but that in reality it is. The language is "until the President shall have invited the Governments of all nations to send delegates," and so forth. That is a direction. It may not be so technically, but it is so in reality. And, secondly, it is going to confuse the President, because this conference must be a conference to which an invitation is to be extended to all nations.

There is no qualification. It is not limited. It says all the nations of the earth, which means the assembling of all the nations in a convention, whether they have any ability in armament or not, whether they have even considered it or not in any conference. The language here is that no money can be used until the President has called in conference all the nations of the earth. Now, I do not think this Congress has any such idea in mind at all. It would certainly saddle upon the President an obligation that might defeat the very purpose we have in mind. And, gentlemen of the committee, it would certainly be an indiscreet thing, within two weeks of the time when the President elect is to assume the Executive authority of the Nation, for this Congress, in the dying days of its session, to write such a limitation of authority upon the President of the United States, and to say that we do not propose to expend any money for the completion of any program unless he does what we say he must do, without having ever consulted him about what his purpose is and what his idea of reaching disarmament may be.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I am sorry I can not. My time is too short. I can not imagine that this Congress, under these circumstances, only two weeks before its expiration, will write such a limitation upon the authority of the President.

Secondly, gentlemen of the committee, assuming that we all want the same result—I want to be counted in the group who want to see disarmament—but assuming that we are all agreed as to the end we want to reach here, this is assuming that we must take only one means, and that is to forbid the use of any

money to finish this program until the President has acted. If we do that, then I ask the membership of this committee, What is our strategic position in the world to demand disarmament if we want to demand it?

The old Quaker said, "Keep your powder dry," and if we want to reach disarmament we had better keep the leverage now within our hands to command disarmament. The way to do that is not to say to the world, "We are waiting for you to say what you shall do, and then we will see what we will do." We propose still to regard human nature as human nature has been; and while human nature is as it now is, we propose still to be ready. Only five years ago, as my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] suggested a moment ago, we were all crying for preparedness and damning everybody because we had not prepared. Now, to-day, with the country as it is now, with the nations of the world as they now are, we are assuming again, just as we did five years ago, that human nature has changed and that, whatever happened in the past, we can now afford to go to sleep and live in a fool's paradise. If we are going to make a move to disarm, let us wait until the power that will take the authority two weeks from now is heard, and then this Congress can proceed to act in accordance. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the committee is entitled to know that the time thus far has been consumed mostly by those opposed to the amendment and that a number of Members who have indicated their desire to speak upon the amendment have not informed the Chair upon which side of the question they intend to speak. There is only one gentleman on the list who has indicated to the Chair that he desires time to speak in favor of the amendment. That is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG]. If he is present and desires recognition, the Chair will recognize him. If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in my view of the present world situation there never was and there never can be a better time to carry out the policy of disarmament than at the present moment. The people not only of our own Nation but of all the nations of the earth are now bending under tax burdens. To keep up the program of armament in the nations of the earth means additional tax burdens. Personally I want to see the day come when we can discontinue the building of these great armaments in our own country. But one trouble in the equation is this: That when you seek to cut down your Military Establishment, or when you seek to cut down the building of these armaments, you find springing up in various sections of the Nation all kinds of agitation, propaganda of every kind, that goes into the press of the Nation and seeks to control the public thought suggesting that some war is imminent. Selfish interests usually give birth to these publications. They do it for private gain. They are munition makers, gun manufacturers, steel interests, and explosive manufacturers.

As an illustration of the point I am making, there is now pending before this body one of the fundamental pieces of legislation that ought to be enacted into law for the purpose of protecting the live-stock interests of this country and the consuming public of this country—I refer to the packer bill. Yet propaganda has sprung up thick and fast over the heads of Members of this Congress in order to forestall and prevent the consideration of that important piece of legislation that is now on the calendar of the House. Among that propaganda is a letter recently addressed to Members of Congress by the Chamber of Commerce of the United State of America with its headquarters in the Mills Building in this city. They have communicated with the chambers of commerce all over this Nation, and you and I are getting telegrams from members of those chambers of commerce who know nothing about the attitude or the merits of this bill. Where does this letter from this Chamber of Commerce of the United States obtain its inspiration? I see the last name on the letterhead is Thomas E. Wilson, one of the five big packers of the Nation. He dominates this chamber of commerce, and I say this chamber of commerce is wiring other chambers of commerce, in order that you and I may have the kick back, in order that this important piece of legislation now pending here, that can be enacted into law in 24 hours, may have its consideration prevented, and in order to forestall this House in providing a parliamentary status that enables you and me to vote for this measure.

Who is Mr. Wilson? He is at the head of Institute of Meat Packers located in this city, spending its millions of money in literature and publications that go throughout the length and breadth of this Nation. Packer propaganda pure and simple. Those millions are extracted from the live-stock producers on the one hand and from the consuming public on the other hand.

It is for this reason and many others that I have joined in reporting out this legislation, and it is for this reason among other compelling ones that I am appealing to the responsible majority to give us a parliamentary status so that we may vote upon this bill. I have appealed in vain to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the majority leader. His record is made. He will do nothing to help bring about packer legislation. I now appeal to the last source of power in this House, and that is the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], the chairman of the great Rules Committee, who comes from a great stock-raising State, with every member of his delegation committed to vote for this bill. I appeal to the gentleman to respond to the wishes of his constituency, the people of his State and the members of his delegation. Give us that rule, and I pledge the country that you will have legislation within 24 hours. The burden is on the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. What will be his answer to his constituency and the country? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there is a right way and a wrong way to do things. Some of the most meritorious causes that the world has known have been lost by reason of the unwise action of the friends of those causes. No man on earth hopes more ardently than I do for the day when armaments may be limited—they will never be abolished—but they may and should be limited. I will go as far as any living man to aid in securing an agreement for limiting armaments.

More than that, I will follow any man in an effort to reduce our own appropriations so far as it is possible to reduce them with safety, even before we secure such an agreement. In a very few days we are to have a new administration, and the incoming Chief Magistrate has told us, both publicly and privately, that it is his will and purpose to do all that can properly be done to secure an agreement among the nations of the world not only for the reduction of military and naval establishments, but for the peaceful adjustment of all questions arising among nations.

We do not know just what it may seem wise to do in getting the nations of the world around a council table to consider not only this question, but other important questions as well. And if we hope and expect a wise decision and a settlement not only of this question but of other great questions, it is our duty to leave the new Chief Executive soon to take his seat free to advise and suggest such arrangements as in his good judgment will bring these things to pass. Should he hesitate, should he delay, the Congress will be in session and it can then, not in a moment without consideration in the way of a limitation on an appropriation bill, but by carefully considered legislation call upon the Chief Executive to invite the nations into council for this most excellent purpose.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. If I have the time.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman inform us whether it is his expectation that this House before it adjourns will have any other opportunity to express its views on this most important question?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know as to that, but I will say to the gentleman that I do not think it highly important that this House pass on the matter, because the President has authority to do this very thing now. For reasons which he thinks wise, sufficient, and proper he has not called a conference for this particular purpose. He has the authority to do it. The new President is favorable to the reduction of armament. We believe that he will early in his administration take steps to bring the nations together for this and other useful and helpful purposes. If he does not, Congress will be in session and there will be enough time to act, after careful consideration and not hastily in an amendment on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman in favor of the amendment?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I expect to favor it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, although I expect to vote for the amendment, I am not particularly concerned about it. I do think, however, that the debate has shown pretty clearly that we are attempting to do something, when we undertake to pass this particular appropriation bill, that we might well refrain from trying to do now. Gentlemen have spoken of the embarrassment that may be occasioned by attaching this amendment to the pending bill. But there can be no embarrassment by postponing the consideration of the bill. I, for one, very much hope the rumor that the bill will not pass at this session may be

verified. There is to be no expenditure until July 1, and action can be deliberately taken at the extra session. I shall vote against the passage of the bill because of my belief that it is being now prematurely considered. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] some time ago announced to the House and the country that it was his policy to "clear the deck" of all appropriation matters at this session. In my opinion he made a mistake. It seems to me he ought not to press for naval appropriations until the deck is otherwise cleared. In a very short time, as he reminds us, the President elect is to be inaugurated. I can not doubt that on the 4th of March the country will receive an announcement from the President elect which will serve in a way to clear the deck. It is inconceivable to me that there should not be such an announcement, not only with respect to disarmament but with respect to the independence of the Philippines, which I discussed a short time ago as bearing on the possibility of war, and with respect to a much more important matter, and that is the entrance into or the creation of an association of nations, which, after all, is the only method of accomplishing the purpose we all profess to have in view.

The question of world peace is the overwhelmingly important question. It is a question the President elect and Congress must deal with. If we are to save the world, including the United States, from being only free in a limited sense to carry on normal activities and more than half enslaved by fear of war and the burdens of war, the question of world peace is of infinitely more consequence than the question of tax revision or the tariff question or than any other question.

I would like to see Army and Navy appropriations delayed until we shall have from the statesman elected by an enormous vote of the American people such an announcement as will blaze the way for an earnest and successful effort to do something that will really afford a genuine promise of peace in the future and a guaranty against the threat and burdens of militarism. [Applause.]

It is idle to talk of a disarmament agreement as alone effective; it is idle to talk of an international court as the only thing desirable, although it is very desirable; it is idle to talk of solving the problem by gathering the nations together periodically in mere conference. The only expedient that is going to solve the problem—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the time for debate is fixed.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I desire only two minutes. Mr. Chairman, I very greatly regret that I can not vote for the pending amendment. This appropriation bill, or the appropriations in it, take effect and become available on July 1 next. At that time the new President will have been in office nearly four months. The pending amendment provides that no part of the sum for naval construction shall be available for expenditure until the President has called an international conference. If he acts according to what we believe he will do, he will call the international conference, if authorized, before the 1st of July; but, in any event, as soon as the conference is called the appropriation becomes available and it becomes the duty of the officials of the Government to go ahead with the expenditure of the money under the contracts now in force; and we would present a pretty spectacle to the world in holding up the appropriation until the conference is called, and then, when they come here, have them find that we were building a navy as fast as we could. I believe the Republican side of the House can afford to trust to the integrity of purpose of the President elect, and I appeal to the generosity of the Democratic side of the House to give the President the opportunity before the 1st of July to keep faith with the country. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the situation has been so well stated by a number of gentlemen and has been summed up so ably by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] who has just taken his seat that I am satisfied that the committee is ready to take a vote, and I ask for a vote at this time.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a friendly question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. UPSHAW. Many of us here who are passionately in favor of disarmament and who are almost afraid to vote against this amendment lest some would misunderstand our position,

and who are anxious not to trample upon any legislative amenities, and likewise anxious to assert our faith in the President elect of the United States, would like to see our way clear before we vote. Therefore will the gentleman from Michigan be kind enough to tell us whether we will have an opportunity between now and the end of the present Congress to declare how we feel on this question? We are anxious to stand by you, but we are more anxious to let the world know that we are in favor of disarmament.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, of course I am speaking here to-day simply as the representative of the Committee on Appropriations. I know that my distinguished friend from Georgia understands that I have not the authority to say whether a resolution upon the general subject of disarmament could be considered in the House during the next two weeks or not. That, of course, is beyond any authority that I might have in the premises. I shall conclude the debate, however, by saying that disarmament, or at least a reduction of armament, is something that lies very close to the hearts of the people of this country and probably of the entire world. [Applause.] I do not believe that there ever will be disarmament, but there will be reduction of armament. When a convention is called for the purpose of reducing armament one of the stumbling blocks in the way of success may be the fact that some one great nation with a predominance of sea power may be loath to let go of such an advantage. In my judgment, speaking plainly, the question of reduction of armament will be settled largely by the attitude of Great Britain and the United States toward each other. There is no reason why Great Britain and America should not always be friends [applause], and they will be more likely to remain friends if they go down the lanes of the future together as equals on the sea. [Applause.]

In my opinion, whenever America and Great Britain agree to an equality on the sea the long hoped for day of reducing armaments will be at hand. The finishing of this program will advance the cause of disarmament by making the two great English-speaking peoples of the world equals on the sea. On the basis of equality an agreement for the reduction of armament should not be long delayed. Such a consummation would make the incoming administration the benefactor not only of America but of all mankind. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for the amendment which I offered awhile ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brooks of Illinois as a substitute for the pending amendment: "That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, at his discretion, to invite the Governments of all nations to send accredited delegates to an international convention, to be held in the United States, to consider ways and means of bringing about joint disarmament."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. It is not a limitation and it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It directs the President to do something.

Mr. MADDEN. It directs the President to do something that is not provided for in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 30, noes 124.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, line 21, after the word "expended," strike out "\$53,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$33,000,000."

Page 43, line 3, after the word "expended," strike out "\$33,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$13,000,000."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I favored the last amendment because I truly believed that the stamp of approval of this House would have furthered the

calling of a conference or convention of delegates of the world powers to consider ways and means to reduce armaments. I am opposed to the amendment just offered, because I believe that we should appropriate all the money required to complete our naval program, if it is \$90,000,000 or \$190,000,000, in order to uphold the hands of the President elect when he demands of these delegates that we shall have proportional disarmament. He can use that as a lever; he can use that as a pawn and say to the rest of the world, "The world is poor, very, very poor, and we are poor also, but we are richer than any nation in the world, and we are ready, if the rest of the world is going to arm, to have the biggest Navy, not simply a Navy equal to that of Great Britain, but the biggest Navy in the world and the biggest Army in the world—we are ready if we are forced to do so—to have universal military conscription in this country," as much as I am opposed to it. We should not reduce the amount provided in this bill, but if necessary increase it, so that the President at this conference can say, "Unless you agree to the demands of the American Nation we are ready to go ahead and have the biggest armament of you all." [Applause.]

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to add to the gaiety of nations. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, there has been what appears to me considerable bluffing going on recently in regard to the possibilities of a warship being destroyed by a bomb from an airplane. I notice that on one side it is claimed that an airplane fleet can absolutely destroy a navy, and the Navy responds with the statement that it is impossible to hit a battleship in motion with a bomb from an airplane. Now, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and I want to see it tried.

Mr. BUTLER. So do I.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I want the bluff to stop and the practice to commence. Will the Navy furnish the battleship? Oh, they say they will, but will they, and give the Army a chance to destroy it. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. May I say to the gentleman that we have the assurance that one will be furnished?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, I have heard the bluff. I want to know whether they will do it, not to have a naval airplane try to hit it and miss it, but to put the Army on the qui vive. What a great test it will be with the Navy striving its best to see that the ship can not be hit and the Army striving its best to see if it can hit the ship. There is a battle worthy of your steel. I hope the bluff will stop and that we will use some of these old battleships to demonstrate the possibilities, because I believe, having always been an air man myself [laughter], that the day of the battleship is soon to pass, and that no navy or army can stand against a country which possesses the control of the air. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman has not correctly stated the position of the Navy.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I have not stated the position of the Navy. I think they are bluffing.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman undertook to say that the Navy claims that no airship with a bomb could strike a battleship. No such claim has ever been made.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They have made the claim in the newspapers, that is all I know of it, with authoritative statements coming from authorized officials in the Navy, and naval officers have told me personally the same thing, that bombs could not hit a moving battleship when fired from an airplane. I do not know whether they can or not.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am not one of those who would want to be on the battleship.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. FISH. Is it not a fact that during the war Ensign Richard Cutler got a bomb on a German submarine and put that submarine out of action before—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know whether it was or not. It might have been an accident, but what I want to know is whether they can do it as a matter of war and as a matter of planning, because they might accidentally hit one of these battleships. Therefore I would like to see them use more than one of these old ships. They might hit the first one, but I would want to see whether they can hit the second one and thus use up some of these old, worthless ships that ought to be put to the bottom of the sea now. Let us not have bluffing, let us try it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment. I do not think that there is the slightest question of a doubt about the desire of the peoples of the world for disarma-

ment, but I think there is considerable doubt about just how the disarmament scheme is to be made effective, and just who, if anyone, is to predominate in military affairs, either on the seas or the land after the disarmament commission has settled its work. My impression is that the people of America to-day are opposed to disarmament or to a naval holiday of any kind that will at any time to come put America in a second-class position on the high seas. I do not think the American people want that, irrespective of the high taxation in effect to-day.

Suppose the insidious propaganda that is now coming almost exclusively from London, via Paris, Tokyo, and other international centers, brings about or makes effective a naval holiday, what would the result be? It would mean, gentlemen, that for all time to come we would be a secondary power on the high seas—second to Great Britain.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. No. I know the gentleman's views, and I have only five minutes.

And for all time to come nothing could ever put us in a first-class position with England. And I for one am not ready to place the reliance of my country upon the British Navy and the British Government to the extent that we should sacrifice our future prospects of peace. One might just as well suggest that you can give up your life-insurance policy because you are in good health to-day, or cancel your fire-insurance policy because there has not been a fire in your neighborhood for 50 or 100 years. I do not think the American public, notwithstanding its desire for disarmament is in unison on the naval holiday scheme that will make us perpetually second to England.

Gentlemen on the floor of the House, before we got into the war, know that it was necessary for us to go to the British ambassador here in Washington in order to get a permit to ship this stand here, or anything else, to South America in an American bottom from New York, because of the coal-bunker system of the British all over the world. They controlled shipping, and no ship left the port of New York, or Philadelphia, or New Orleans, or San Francisco, unless it agreed to abide by the decision of the British Government that everything going into that ship must be viséd by the British ambassador here in Washington. You know that condition existed. They positively controlled our business all over the world, but they did it as a friendly power.

That condition would not have prevailed if we had had a Navy equal to England. And I for one am going to insist as long as I can, when the time for disarmament or a naval holiday occurs, that our Navy shall be as great as any other on earth. One might suggest that Great Britain is 3,000 miles away, and why not allow Great Britain, with its great merchant marine, to be the predominant power on the seas? My reply is, why not go further and let us be a third-class power? That Japan does not want anything in America, so let our Navy retrograde below that of Japan, and so along down the line until we reach the level of China, not to a second or third-class Navy, but to a fifth-class position?

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs unanimously rejected a Senate resolution which would promote a cessation of shipbuilding activity during which time a naval "holiday" or naval disarmament might receive the serious attention of the world's great powers.

At the same time, London dispatches to American papers indicate that Sir Auckland Geddes, the British ambassador to America, is on his way to America with proposals for a conference of the nations with a view to partial disarmament in the near future.

The suggestion of a naval holiday has been so insistently put forth by Great Britain that it now bears all the ear-marks of official propaganda. This is easily understood. There is no human way for the British Navy to retain the supremacy of the sea without this naval holiday. It will insure to England permanent leadership of the seas.

Mr. Chairman, it has always been argued that England has been the bulwark of peace because of her power upon the seas. Now that England occupies a secondary financial condition in the world and we are the greatest Nation on earth, it is but natural that the supremacy of the seas should fall to us, and as our foreign policy has always been the opposite to England's in the matter of conquest of territory and colonial possessions, America's superiority on the seas would prove even a more substantial guarantee of a world peace than has heretofore prevailed. The repeated suggestion coming from England that a naval holiday ensue and that America and England forego for a period of years their shipbuilding construction plans is entirely one sided in the interest of England, because she has no battle-ship-construction program and has not laid down a first-class

fighting ship keel for two years, has none in contemplation, and the suggestion of a naval holiday coming from her at this time is farcical rather than sincere.

It is this same naval holiday suggestion that was made by England to Germany prior to the World War and which Germany ridiculed and rejected because its sole intention was to sustain British sea power at the expense of any prospective rival.

Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly appreciate the necessity of economy in every governmental direction, but to hold up the 1916 naval construction program already 96 per cent contracted for and in part due us from European countries on loans made during the war, if England were to suggest to the American people that our greatest life insurance policy be canceled, it would come with as good grace as this one-sided naval holiday proposition.

Mr. Chairman, one might as well suggest to the country that because of the general demand for economy we allow our life insurance policies to lapse and fire insurance policies on our homes to be canceled and that we refrain from all other expenditures for the protection of our property. I do not think that the American people will receive kindly this lopsided, deceptive scheme which is proposed solely in the interest of England, and it is my intention to leave nothing undone, so far as I am personally concerned, in order to finish our authorized battleship program which will by January 1, 1924, give us a total tonnage of first-line fighting ships of 1,118,000 tons as against the British first-line fighting ships of 984,000 tons. With this in mind I introduced the following resolution in the House of Representatives on January 6:

Joint resolution confirming the action of past Congresses for the establishment of an American Navy capable of affording the greatest measure of protection to American commerce, American life, and American principles, and to maintain our national independence within our own control.

Whereas men prominent in official life of Great Britain and Japan, who apparently speak authoritatively, have been quoted in recent news dispatches as desirous of promoting an agreement or a treaty between those two countries and the United States Government whereby a so-called naval holiday shall prevail for a number of years, during which time there shall be a partial cessation in the warship building programs of the several aforesaid countries, in the interest of economy and international good will; and

Whereas there are now building under various stages of completion in the private and Government shipbuilding yards of the United States, by authority of Congress, 11 dreadnaughts, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, 11 miscellaneous ships, 45 destroyers, and 47 submarines, the final completion of which will make the American Navy second to none on earth; and

Whereas as 96 per cent of all tonnage authorized in present building program has been completed, or is under contract for completion, the permanent abatement of work on any of these big ships would result in wasteful salvage and costly settlements with hundreds of contractors and subcontractors, which would unquestionably prove extravagant, unwise, unbusinesslike, and certainly not economical; and

Whereas it is generally known that England has no naval building program nor is she building any first-line ships, so that any suggestions coming from London and Tokyo for a "naval holiday" are not primarily in the interest of economy and good will among nations, but solely in the interest of perpetuating British dominance on the high seas; and

Whereas the fact that Great Britain and Japan are bound by a secret offensive and defensive treaty which probably calls for the tremendous military expansion in aviation on the part of Great Britain, while Japan proceeds in the building of warships at a rate far in excess of anything heretofore undertaken by that country, the two naval activities combined with the navies of these two countries, making an almost invincible sea power: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the United States is unwilling to commit its economic and political independence to the fetters of an international treaty materially limiting naval armaments, thereby involving its freedom of action in ways and for objects not at present discernible, and that all warship construction authorized to date, be completed in the shortest practicable time commensurate with the Nation's desire for economy and sound business practice in the private and Government shipbuilding yards.

Mr. Chairman, our Naval Intelligence has brought forth figures to show that we have 33 battleships and battle cruisers built and building while Great Britain has 35 of the same character. When we complete the program of 1916, authorized merely to give us a naval strength commensurate with our position in international affairs, we shall have an advantage of 8,638 tons per ship over the British. In main batteries we shall have 340 guns to 314 for them. Our guns will average 14½ inches in caliber as compared to 13½ inches for theirs. In a broadside we shall hurl 548,400 pounds, as against 452,000 pounds. In the secondary battery our guns will number 491 to Britain's 526; but ours have 5.4 inches caliber while theirs have 4.9 inches. We are to have 322 destroyers to 350 for Britain; but ours are to be superior in speed and more up to date. In submarines we are to be equal—150 apiece—and in this field American ingenuity is to throw the weight on our side.

Our ships being more modern, larger, of heavier armor and armament, with superior muzzle velocity, and assuming the personnel aboard to be equal, we would have a net fighting superiority of from 31 to 50 per cent.

These figures have been noted on the floor of the House of Parliament, and are most distressing to British statesmen and those who have taken great pride in British sea power of the past.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, it is being suggested that our naval personnel may be reduced from the present 143,000 to 100,000 for the next fiscal year, and this reduction might be even more disastrous to our aspirations on the high seas than a reduction in ships. After all, our greatest fighting machines are nothing more nor less than cold steel, and their value must depend on a highly efficient personnel, and not on a reserve force that might be hastily gathered from shops, offices, delivery wagons, and so forth. Without a highly trained personnel the figures I have quoted above concerning the relative strength of our Navy and the British Navy mean nothing. I do not see how our Navy, which is constantly expanding, can hope to get along successfully with less than the number of men authorized last year, and I believe that 143,000 is the minimum number that should be provided for during the coming fiscal year; and even this number will make it necessary to lay up in reserve more than one-half of our new destroyers and many other fighting craft of excellent character.

I hope to see the time when our entire Navy may employ extensive war maneuvers once a year, and this can only be accomplished by an adequate permanent and reserve personnel.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I want to very heartily indorse what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said about opportunity being given to the Air Service to make good the statement which they have so repeatedly made, not only before our committee but in the press, that an airship can successfully destroy and put out of business a battleship with one bomb. Now, if that is true, a battleship becomes virtually a useless implement of war, and yet it is by all odds the most expensive to build, most expensive in the use of raw material, and most expensive in the consumption of man power to manage. A bombing plane can be made for \$30,000 to \$40,000. A battleship or a battleship cruiser costs from thirty to forty or fifty millions of dollars. It requires over three years to construct one. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggests, if the Navy is absolutely certain as to their position; if the Secretary of the Navy is certain that his position that the most important factor in the Navy is the battleship, they certainly ought to be willing to take some of these ships which they are ready to scrap and give Gen. Mitchell and these aircraft people the opportunity to destroy them. And they say that they will demonstrate it to the satisfaction of Congress and to the satisfaction of the experts. They say, "If we can not do it we will then close the case and say no more about it."

Mr. ROSE. Is it possible to stage a battle like that in time of peace as it is likely to occur in time of war?

Mr. Sisson. They think so. I am like the gentleman from Illinois, in that I have so much confidence in it that I would like to see it tried. They said in answer to the question, "Is it extremely dangerous to get down close enough to a battleship to place a bomb where it can be effective?" "Yes; but a soldier who is not willing to take chances ought not be in the service."

Mr. BEE. I understood the gentleman from Illinois to say, if they dropped these bombs on a moving ship. Now, I am serious, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I would like to know who is going to man that ship while they are practicing on it.

Mr. Sisson. I am willing for them to work that out themselves. As I understand, they do not propose to drop a bomb of sufficient destructive power to put the ship out of business. They take a dummy, and the dummy is exactly like and has exactly the same weight as the other shell. Therefore, they drop the dummy on the ship with the ship at full speed. And, by the way, they do not want to know the direction the ship is to take.

Mr. OLIVER. Why not demonstrate that cavalry is of no use and that infantry is of no use, by letting the airplanes attack them when they are unprotected by airplanes? The Navy claims its ships will be protected by airplanes.

Mr. Sisson. That is entirely a new question. On the contrary, we must defend our battleships, of course, with airships. That is absolutely true. But if it means that the nation that gets the supremacy of the air can then destroy the Navy, your Navy will be useless, and they will admit that, and the experts will admit it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have some sympathy with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON]. I wish it were possible to reduce this appropriation, or

these appropriations, as he suggests, by \$40,000,000, and still meet our contract obligations and keep the work on our fleet program going in an economic and economical manner. But I do not believe that would be possible. The gentlemen of the appropriating committee, and particularly of the subcommittee, will bear witness to the fact that I conferred earnestly with them, and went into some detail with them, as to the facts of the situation with regard to this program. I very much hoped the sum total for the building program might be \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 less than it is.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. If disarmament is soon agreed upon, would it not be possible to withhold this \$40,000,000 for the present, and yet not disturb the building program to any great extent?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I think that if we get an agreement as to reduction of armament, it might be possible to slacken up a bit on construction; but I have some doubts about that. Starting in with the idea that it might be possible to eliminate some of the larger ships of our program, I have rather arrived at the conclusion expressed by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KELLEY of Michigan], that it is somewhat doubtful whether that can be done; it is possible we have proceeded to the point where, reduction of armament or no reduction of armament, we can not wisely suspend operations on the program now under way. At any rate, I doubt if we can proceed in a reasonably businesslike way with the program for much less than the committee has provided.

But I do not want to make this suggestion, and, Mr. Chairman, I rose particularly to make this suggestion, that this is quite enough. If the committee has fallen into any error at all—and I do not want to say that they have—it has been in being quite liberal, and I hope the House will remember that when the bill comes back from another body, if the amount should be increased. Now, let me say to my friend from Virginia—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I can not agree with my friend from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] as to the wisdom and propriety of allowing some of the appropriation bills to fail. I think it is of the utmost importance that they should all pass. I received a telegram from the President elect this morning, expressing the hope that Congress would be able to dispose of its appropriation program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment. Much would be lost if we did not pass them, and nothing would be gained.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was wondering if there was any more urgency now in the necessity of securing the passage of all the appropriations than there was two years ago, when a number of them failed?

Mr. MONDELL. There is, because we are now passing from one administration into another. I think all of the bills ought to have been passed then. But at that time we were in the midst of an administration. Then the estimates which had been submitted could be resubmitted. Now we are passing from one administration to another. The new administration would feel the necessity of preparing and submitting entirely new estimates, which it might take months to prepare.

This \$90,000,000 is enough; it is quite sufficient, I am satisfied. I believe the chairman of the subcommittee and all the members of the subcommittee believe that it is enough to carry on as rapidly as we ought to carry on our building program; and while I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will not prevail, because I think that would reduce the amount available improperly, I hope that we shall all be steadfast in not agreeing to a larger sum should it be increased when the bill shall have been returned from another body. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has again expired. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the question of the sufficiency of the appropriation for the new construction depends upon the policy to be pursued. The \$90,000,000 that is carried in the bill for new construction will slow down the construction for two years if it is continued at that rate, whereas if the amount is increased it would complete it in two years. The original idea

was that it would be completed by 1923. At the rate of \$90,000,000 that is carried in the bill it will be continued until 1925. Contracts have been made for the delivery of materials, and the contractors have the right to expect the payment of the money according to the contracts, and it is very probable that the contractors will submit damages against the Government for the failure of the Government to meet its obligations according to contracts that were authorized under the former directions of the Congress.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my study of the question as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, without going into the number of considerations that dictated it, prompts me to entertain the belief that the wise course is to proceed with the 1916 program of naval construction, and I am one of those who most heartily and earnestly desire a scrapping, if possible, of all the navies of the world and the establishment of an accord between the nations by which these tremendous burdens of armament can be lifted from the shoulders of the world. If the world is not going to adopt some rule by which the principles of right and justice can be substituted for force, then perforce the nations of the world must retain the instrumentalities and instruments of an arbitrament by force, and however much we may shrink, there is nothing for the United States to do, in my judgment, if that method is adhered to, but to have the best assortment of the instruments of force that it is possible to get.

I hope sincerely—I pray—that some method will be worked out by which this bankrupting policy of competitive armaments can be done away with. It is up to that side and that party to devise a method. We offered the country one which we thought was adequate. It was rejected. Whatever may be done in the future, I think as a matter of practical statecraft and business the wisest thing is to complete the 1916 program, even though we have a reasonable assurance that in the future some plan will be worked out to effect disarmament.

Now, I do not believe that the battleship is rendered obsolete by the inventions of aerial warfare. With every new invention in offensive warfare the argument comes that the old instrumentalities have been rendered obsolete. And yet uniformly in the past we found, and we still find, taking the history of the development of our defensive and offensive methods, that every time a new weapon of great power is found it renders obsolete the types of defensive weapons that we heretofore used, but we always find, too, that in these battles between offensive and defensive weapons the inventors engaged in devising new defensive methods always find a way to counter and check, and so we have a constant battle between the offensive and the defensive. Now, when the submarine torpedo was invented it was predicted that the battleship was obsolete and no longer useful. The submarine torpedo did work radical changes and it made radical changes necessary. It had to be met, and it was met in two ways—first, by inventing an offensive weapon to attack it and destroy it; and, in the second place, by improved defensive methods to lessen the damage in case the battleship was struck by a torpedo; in other words, a change in the design of battleships.

The same thing would doubtless follow from the invention of aerial fighting and bombing. We will have to devise offensive weapons suitable to attack the air forces of an enemy. No doubt also it is to work radical changes in the design of our battleships, just as the submarine torpedo did heretofore. But it does not follow at all that because the type of battleship is to be changed, because its structure is to be changed, it is going to do away completely with the battleship class and render it obsolete. Let us take up the argument that the battleship is rendered obsolete and push it to its conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. VENABLE. May I have five minutes additional?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENABLE. Let us push that argument to its logical conclusion. Certainly, if the battleship is rendered obsolete by the aerial bomb, then other surface craft are also rendered obsolete for the same reason, and if we are going to do away with the battleship altogether, the logic is that we will have to do away with all other surface craft. The result is that you reduce fighting between nations simply to an air warfare. In the first place, no nation could permit this to stand, for the reason that air warfare never would be decisive. From the very nature of the thing the forces engaged must be of such a character and such size and the damage done so great and so serious as to be more or less decisive of the control of the surface of the sea.

Otherwise nations might fight for a million years, simply building aircraft at home and sending them out to fight the air fleets of other nations, and when they were destroyed build new ones, and the thing could go on indefinitely. From the very nature of things the nations would eventually be driven to bringing such masses of men and metal together that the battle when it took place would be decisive one way or the other, if they were going to put an end to the war or to the campaign.

Now, I am fully persuaded that aerial warfare and the developments of aviation are to produce most radical changes in the type, structure, and design of our battleships and other surface craft—

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENABLE. I will yield in a moment. Let me complete this statement. That being true, these vessels being so costly, the wise thing to do is to be liberal in appropriations for experimentations with aerial warfare, so that at the earliest possible moment we will know the possibilities of it, and know the changes in design which it makes necessary, and what offensive weapons against it are demanded, so that we can conform the construction of our battleships and other surface craft design to meet the needs of this new type of warfare. Otherwise, while we are saving a few millions by a close-fisted policy in appropriations for aviation we are possibly throwing away hundreds of millions of dollars, because if we go on building ships without the necessary knowledge of what they will have to meet with reference to aerial warfare we will wake up some morning after investing hundreds of millions of dollars in battleships and find that they have been made second-class and second-line fighting ships because they have not been built to meet the requirements of the new methods of fighting. Now I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LUCE. In the very admirable and helpful statement of the gentleman he has reached just the point of difficulty in my own mind. Will he illuminate the question further by telling me what, if any, changes in the 1916 program have already been decided upon as a result of the situation that he has laid before us so lucidly?

Mr. VENABLE. I am frank to say to the gentleman that I have not. I have no information other than a general statement from Admiral Taylor, Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, that they would endeavor to embody the lessons of the late war in the designs of these vessels.

Mr. LUCE. Is it possible to alter the plans of ships already under contract?

Mr. VENABLE. Oh, I think so. They can strengthen them in many ways—in the thickness of the armor, in the inclination of the vessels—

Mr. BUTLER. In the protective decks.

Mr. VENABLE. In the protective decks. There are a number of things in which those ships can be changed, up to the time, I suppose, that the structure is actually made. But, aside from that, I am of the opinion that we ought to go on with the 1916 program and with the contracts that have been let, even though the lessons to be learned from experimentations and experience in aerial fighting have not yet been digested, learned, or discovered. I think also that if we are to negotiate with other nations—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I seek this opportunity not to make a speech on the subject under consideration, but simply to offer one or two suggestions that have come to mind.

We have already passed the Army appropriation bill, carrying \$415,000,000. This appropriation bill for the Navy carries \$395,000,000. The total appropriations for these two departments, leaving out of view the very many millions that we appropriated in the deficiency bills, amount to \$810,000,000. There are 48 States in the Union, and this means an appropriation of \$17,000,000 for the Army and Navy for only one year applied to each State in the Union. This vast sum of \$810,000,000 would build eight great paved public highways from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. [Applause.] The question arises in my mind, when are we going to end this sort of business? Are we going to keep it up until we finally break down the American taxpayers and destroy them in their effort to earn a livelihood? It seems to me that the committee that has had these measures in charge ought in some way to have been able to bring in bills here carrying a less maximum than that carried by the two bills which have been put up to this House for passage.

As a protest, I am going to vote against the bill, not that I am opposed to a strong Navy, but for the reason that I believe we ought to call a halt and give the taxpayer time to get his breath. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER: Page 43, line 5, after the figures "\$90,000,000," insert: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation can be expended except on vessels now being constructed or heretofore contracted for."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the amendment. Strike out the words "or heretofore contracted for."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS to the amendment: Strike out the words "or heretofore contracted for."

Mr. HASTINGS. Let me ask a question of the gentleman from Alabama. I understood from this discussion earlier in the day that he was in favor of a limitation so that no money would be used except for vessels under actual construction—for instance, where the keel has been laid. I want to ask him or the chairman of the committee whether or not there are any vessels contracted for where the keel has not been laid and no work done upon them?

Mr. OLIVER. The bill of 1916 authorized the construction of 157 vessels. There are 6 submarines, 12 destroyers, and 1 transport for which no contract has been let. The purpose of the amendment is to provide that no money shall be expended on vessels heretofore authorized and not yet contracted for. The reason why I put in the words "now being constructed" was to cover the case of those being built in private yards as well as those being constructed in navy yards.

Mr. HASTINGS. All of those contracted for?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. Millions of dollars have been expended thereon.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, if construction work is begun on all of the vessels authorized, why did the gentleman insert the words "heretofore contracted for"?

Mr. OLIVER. There are some vessels where no contract has been let.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And they are under construction?

Mr. OLIVER. No; the gentleman did not catch my reply. There are some vessels not technically contracted for upon which contract work has been begun. There are about 12 vessels that have not been contracted for and this would prevent any money being expended on them, although they are authorized.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland withdraws his objection, and without objection the gentleman from Oklahoma withdraws his amendment.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and that no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards of the United States, when time and facilities permit, for a sum less than it can be purchased or acquired otherwise.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph down to and including the word "plant," line 22, on page 43.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to strike out the paragraph on page 43, beginning on line 10, down to and including the word "plant" on line 22.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I know that the House is not going to strike this provision out, but I want to put the House on record in regard to it, because this paragraph absolutely prevents the Navy from requiring efficient A No. 1 first-class service from its employees.

There was such a clause put in the Army bill which likewise will prevent the Army or the War Department from requiring first-class, efficient, A No. 1 service of its employees. These employees do not want surveillance, they do not want some Government superintendent to check them up and see that they do the work properly. They want to do just as they please; they want to work when they want to work and they do not want us to say how they shall do the work, either this way or that way. They have demanded you shall put this clause in the bill, and some of my friends criticized me the other day because I tried to strike it out of the Army bill.

Whenever you try to stop somebody from doing something they are determined on doing they are going to criticize you, but that does not keep me from trying to stop it. There ought to be A No. 1 first-class efficiency in the Army employment and in the Navy employment. These employees do not want any card index. It is all right for them to have a card index over you, but they do not want you to have a card index over them. They seek to exert this power over every single man in this House and over every Senator at the other end of the Capitol. They criticize you when you do not do what they want you to do, and they will bound you to death if it is necessary to whip you into line. It is ridiculous the way we do. Your constituents laugh at you. Go to the business men of the country and ask them if they indorse you in exempting the employees of the Army and the Navy from surveillance, from proper efficiency regulations; ask the business men in your district if they indorse you for voting that way and they will laugh at you. You know that they do want efficiency regulations.

Now, why do we continue to vote this way? If, my good friends, you knew how good it was to feel independent and vote like you believe, to vote like you want to vote, if you knew what a great feeling of relief and consolation it is, you never would be satisfied with anything else. You want to try it once. Try how it feels to be independent with no strings tied to you; nobody standing over you with a whip telling you you have got to do so-and-so. They tried that on me when I first came here, but I have always voted the way I wanted to vote. I never got up and spoke one way and voted the other. Try it once and you will appreciate the feeling of voting as you really believe.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up the time of the House very long in opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], but I rise simply to call attention to the fact that this is a matter that has been hashed over here annually for the past seven years. The gentleman seeks to strike out of the bill the so-called stop-watch paragraph. The House went on record the other day overwhelmingly in incorporating it in the Army appropriation bill, and I trust that the House will vote against the amendment just as unanimously as it expressed itself the other day.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I do not intend to take up the time of this House upon this amendment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has talked to-day in the same manner he talked the other day, when the Army appropriation bill was under discussion. I suggest to my good friend that before he offers any more amendments such as this, that he take an afternoon off and go down to the navy yard, get down among the common workmen of the yard, and see whether or not they are performing their duty. I think he wants to be fair, and I think that is a fair way for him to treat the men of the service, rather than to stand up here and criticize them.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, testified before a committee that under such a regulation as this he had 65 per cent efficiency in those navy yards.

Mr. TAGUE. Oh, Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt received his information secondhand, just as the gentleman gets his, by sitting at a desk a long distance from the navy yard.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I do not understand that Mr. Roosevelt attributed that lack of efficiency to this particular law.

Mr. TAGUE. Not at all. There is an efficiency standard in the navy yards, and for the information of the gentleman let me say that every mechanic in the navy yards of the country has a standard set for him in the occupation in which he is employed. They must live up to the requirements of that standard as placed over them by the officers in authority. There

is no need of a stop watch over any man. A man who has to have a stop watch is not fit to work in any institution.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. Is any workman who does his work up to that standard ever embarrassed by virtue of the presence of a stop watch?

Mr. TAGUE. The standard set by the stop watch, as attempted in the Watertown Arsenal, was such that very few of the workmen could live up to the standard, and the best mechanics in that institution were reduced in their rating and were discharged from employment. Later it developed that the men who were used to establish the standards were unable to keep up the pace themselves.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. TAGUE. Certainly.

Mr. WINSLOW. Is not that the fault of the men who set the standard, rather than of the system of the stop watch?

Mr. TAGUE. It is always the men who set the standard, because they set a standard they can not live up to themselves. That is the reason the stop-watch system is not a success.

Mr. WINSLOW. For the purpose of illuminating this subject, I would ask the gentleman if he knows of any factories in his own State of Massachusetts which during the war could get help unless they ran under the piece and bonus system?

Mr. TAGUE. I do not know as to that. I have had very little to do with the employment of labor during the war. But I do know that on account of the shortage of labor that every employer of labor was looking for labor and offering almost any price if they would go into the factories and work.

Mr. WINSLOW. But you could get no labor by the day, and could get none unless you paid at a piece rate, with a bonus on top of that.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to placing in any department, on the head of honest workmen, any un-American, inhuman system that will interfere with any citizen earning an honest living. But that is not the thing I wanted to talk about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAGUE. I arose to call the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to something that I believe they should investigate at once. To-day in the great departments of the United States Government, in the navy yards, and in the arsenals there has been erected at great expense to the Government establishments for the manufacture of supplies—splendid industrial plants—which should be used by several departments, instead of one as is the practice at present. Let me illustrate briefly one or two. To-day in the Navy Department we use a great quantity of rope. The Shipping Board purchase and use rope in great quantities. The War Department, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Commerce, and other departments all purchase and use rope on Government ships. The Government has established in Boston a ropewalk for the manufacture of rope that is not in operation over one-half of the time.

To-day there is piled up in the storehouse millions of pounds of rope manufactured by the Navy Department, yet the War Department, the Shipping Board, and the other departments of the Government that have shops are buying rope in the open market, while the rope already manufactured at the expense of the Government is lying in the storehouse, rotting and deteriorating.

The same can be said of the chain shop at Boston. The chain shop was established at an expense of thousands of dollars of American people's money, and that shop is to-day practically idle, because the Navy Department can not use enough chains to keep the shops up to their capacity, while the departments that use chains are out in the open market buying chains at prices far in excess of the amount of money the Government can manufacture the chains for and give them a better chain than they can purchase in the open market. I believe we could save millions of dollars of the people's money if the Committee on Appropriations would investigate and see to it that where we have industrial departments such as I have mentioned that the Government shall use them up to their capacity.

I hope the Appropriations Committee will look into this matter, and I am sure it will be the means of assisting them in their endeavor to keep down the expenses of some of the departments. They will discover that there are a great many of just such manufacturing plants similar to the ones that

I have mentioned where the money of the people is lying idle, when with a little coordination by the heads of the several departments they could be put into use and be the means of saving large amounts of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 9, yeas 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee will indulge the Chair for a moment, the Chair desires to state that on Saturday he made a ruling holding in order certain amendments providing for additional storage facilities and additional facilities. The Chair feels, upon further reflection, he erroneously held those amendments in order, and he believes that the ruling which he made should not be construed to overrule the precedents which had previously been set, and he regrets the decision has been made and feels it ought not to be held as a precedent overruling previous precedents.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. What effect does that have upon the points of order raised by gentlemen?

The CHAIRMAN. It has no effect upon points of order which have been already decided, but it was stated by the Chair simply for future reference.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 15975, had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment; if not the Chair will put them in gross.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have a separate vote upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Brooks].

The SPEAKER. But that amendment was not adopted in the committee.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit the bill to the Appropriations subcommittee having it in charge with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment, to wit: On page 43, strike out lines 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, down to and including the word "and," in line 22.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion to recommit is not in order, and ask the Speaker to examine the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have it in better form and offer it in better form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit the bill to the Appropriations subcommittee having it in charge with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment, to wit:

"On page 42, line 21, strike out '\$53,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '\$3,000,000'; and in line 24 strike out '\$4,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '\$1,000,000'; and on page 43, in line 3, strike out '\$33,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '\$3,000,000'; and in line 5, strike out '\$90,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof '\$7,000,000'."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion as offered is not in order, and I ask the Speaker to examine the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair supposes on the ground that it refers to a subcommittee?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is one of the grounds.

Mr. BLANTON. It should be the Appropriations Committee. It is to be referred to the committee having it in charge and, of course, it includes the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Of course, if this is a parliamentary school the gentleman might get the motion in order after awhile.

Mr. BLANTON. If I talked with the gentleman from Illinois for three minutes I would have known better.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would not have taken that long.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the subcommittee part be left out. It is to the committee having it in charge. This is a new rule.

The SPEAKER. To the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; this simply changes the motion—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the original amendment offered by the gentleman been modified?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not hear it reported or any request for its modification.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman had a right to request the modification, and the Chair thought it superfluous to take up the time of the House by having it reported. It was modified by making it the Committee on Appropriations. The question is on the motion to recommit as modified.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—yeas 3, noes 157.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Clearly there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 9, noes 282, answered "present" 1, not voting 136, as follows:

YEAS—9.

Blanton	Huddleston	Keller	Quinn
Clark, Mo.	Jones, Tex.	Mansfield	Sherwood
Goodykoontz			

NAYS—282.

Ackerman	Davis, Tenn.	Hicks	Major
Almon	Denison	Hill	Mann, Ill.
Anderson	Dewalt	Hoch	Mapes
Andrews, Nebr.	Dickinson, Iowa	Hoey	Mays
Anthony	Domlnick	Holland	Merritt
Aswell	Dowell	Hudspeth	Michener
Ayres	Drane	Humphreys	Minahan, N. J.
Bankhead	Drewry	Ireland	Monahan, Wis.
Barbour	Dunbar	Jacoway	Mondell
Barkley	Dunn	Jeffers	Montague
Bee	Dupré	Johnson, Miss.	Moore, Ohio
Begg	Eagan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Va.
Benham	Echols	Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Ind.
Benson	Elliot	Jones, Pa.	Mott
Black	Elston	Kearns	Murphy
Bland, Ind.	Esch	Kelley, Mich.	Neely
Bland, Va.	Evans, Mont.	Kettner	Nelson, Mo.
Boies	Evans, Nebr.	Kiess	Newton, Minn.
Bowers	Fairfield	King	Newton, Mo.
Howling	Fess	Kinkaid	Nolan
Box	Fields	Klecza	O'Connor
Brand	Fish	Kraus	Ogden
Briggs	Fisher	Lampert	Oldfield
Brinson	Flood	Langley	Oliver
Britten	Focht	Eanham	Olney
Brooks, Ill.	Foster	Lankford	Osborne
Buchanan	Freeman	Larsen	Overstreet
Burdick	French	Layton	Padgett
Burke	Fuller	Lazaro	Paige
Burroughs	Gallagher	Lee, Calif.	Park
Butler	Garrett	Lee, Ga.	Parker
Byrnes, S. C.	Glynn	Leibach	Parrish
Byrnes, Tenn.	Good	Linthicum	Peters
Campbell, Kans.	Goodall	Little	Porter
Campbell, Pa.	Gould	Luca	Purnell
Carss	Graham, Ill.	Luffin	Radcliffe
Carter	Green, Iowa	Luhling	Rainey, Ala.
Christopherson	Greene, Mass.	McAndrews	Rainey, Henry T.
Cleary	Greene, Vt.	McClintic	Raker
Coady	Griest	McCulloch	Ramsey
Cole	Hadley	McDuffie	Ramseyer
Collier	Hardy, Colo.	McFadden	Randall, Wis.
Connally	Hardy, Tex.	McKeown	Ransley
Cooper	Harrell	McKinley	Rayburn
Cramton	Hastings	McLane	Reavis
Crisp	Hawley	McLaughlin, Mich.	Reber
Crowther	Hayden	McLeod	Reed, N. Y.
Curry, Calif.	Hays	McPherson	Reed, W. Va.
Dallinger	Hernandez	MacGregor	Rhodes
Darrow	Hersey	Madden	Ricketts
Davis, Minn.	Hickey	Magee	Riddick

Robinson, N. C.
Robson, Ky.
Rosenberg
Rogers
Romjue
Rose
Rouse
Rube
Sanders, Ind.
Sanders, N. Y.
Schall
Scott
Shreve
Siegel
Sinclair
Slanett
Sisson
Slomp
Small
Smith, Idaho

Smith, Ill.
Smith, Mich.
Smithwick
Snell
Snyder
Stedman
Steele
Steenerson
Stephens, Miss.
Stephens, Ohio
Stevenson
Strong, Kans.
Summers, Wash.
Summers, Tex.
Sweet
Swindall
Swope
Tague
Taylor, Ark.
Taylor, Colo.

Temple
Thompson
Tillman
Tilson
Timberlake
Tinch
Tinkham
Towner
Upshaw
Vaile
Venable
Vestal
Vinson
Voigt
Volk
Volstead
Walsh
Walters
Ward
Wason

Watkins
Weaver
Webster
Welling
Welly
White, Kans.
White, Me.
Williams
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, La.
Wingo
Winslow
Woods, Va.
Wright
Yates
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Tex.
Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Knutson

NOT VOTING—136.

Andrews, Md.
Ashbrook
Babka
Bacharach
Baer
Bell
Bland, Mo.
Brooks, Pa.
Browne
Brumbaugh
Caldwell
Candler
Cannon
Cantrill
Caraway
Carew
Casey
Chindblom
Clark, Fla.
Classon
Copley
Costello
Crago
Cullen
Currie, Mich.
Dale
Davey
Dempsey
Dent
Dickinson, Mo.
Donovan
Dooling
Doremus
Doughton

Dyer
Eagle
Edmonds
Ellsworth
Emerson
Evans, Nev.
Ferris
Fordney
Frear
Gallivan
Gandy
Ganly
Gard
Garner
Godwin, N. C.
Goldfogle
Goodwin, Ark.
Graham, Pa.
Griffin
Hamill
Hamilton
Harrison
Haugen
Hersman
Houghton
Howard
Hulings
Hull, Iowa
Hull, Tenn.
Husted
Hutchinson
Igoe
James, Mich.
James, Va.

Johnson, Ky.
Johnston, N. Y.
Juhl
Kahn
Kelly, Pa.
Kendall
Kennedy, Iowa
Kennedy, R. I.
Kincheloe
Kitchin
Kreider
Leshner
Longman
Longworth
McArthur
McGlennan
McKinzie
McKinstry
McLaughlin, Nebr.
Maher
Mann, S. C.
Martin
Mason
Mead
Miller
Milligan
Moon
Mooney
Morin
Madd
Nelson, Wis.
Nicholls
O'Connell
Patterson

Pell
Perlman
Phelan
Pou
Rainey, John W.
Randall, Calif.
Riordan
Rowe
Rucker
Sabath
Sanders, La.
Sanford
Scully
Sears
Sells
Sims
Smith, N. Y.
Steagall
Stines
Stoll
Strong, Pa.
Sullivan
Taylor, Tenn.
Thomas
Treadway
Vare
Watson
Whaley
Wheeler
Wilson, Pa.
Wise
Wood, Ind.
Woodyard

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. MASON with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. CHINDELOM with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. MOON.

Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. IGOE.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. PATTERSON with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. CRAGO with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. NICHOLLS.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. DYER with Mr. MCGLENNON.

Mr. WHEELER with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. KINCHELOE.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. STEAGALL.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. GARNER.

Mr. FREAR with Mr. POUL.

Mr. STINESS with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. VARE with Mr. GANLY.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. STOLL.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania, with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. ROWE with Mr. HAMILT.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska with Mr. MAHER.
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. EHRSMAN.
 Mr. MERRITT with Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri.
 Mr. EMERSON with Mr. MARTIN.
 Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. SEARS.
 Mr. KENDALL with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.
 Mr. COPLEY with Mr. JAMES of Virginia.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. LESHNER.
 Mr. CLASSON with Mr. MCKINNEY.
 Mr. CANNON with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. MEAD.
 Mr. HUSTED with Mr. GARD.
 Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. CARAWAY.
 Mr. BAER with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. JUDL with Mr. RANDALL of California.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. DALE with Mr. WHALEY.
 Mr. BROWNE with Mr. WISE.
 Mr. HULINGS with Mr. PEIL.
 Mr. CURRIE of Michigan with Mr. GANDY.
 Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.
 Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay," but I find I am paired with the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BELL, and therefore desire to answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The question is on the passage of the bill.
 The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 208, noes 9.
 So the bill was passed.
 On motion of Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted—
 To Mr. WOODYARD, for three days, on account of illness in his family.
 To Mr. MILLER (at the request of Mr. HADLEY), on account of illness.
 To Mr. WHALEY, on account of death in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, in pursuance of the order previously made, until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 15, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

411. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report in connection with a claim for loss through burglary of the post office at Lumberton, Miss.; to the Committee on Claims.

412. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of channel north of Shooters Island, between New York and New Jersey, with a view to removing the shoal west of Shooters Island to a depth of 16 feet; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

413. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of San Diego Harbor, Calif., from the entrance to the National City line (H. Doc. No. 1000); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with map.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Illinois, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16076) authorizing bestowal upon the unknown, unidentified British soldier

buried in Westminster Abbey and the unknown, unidentified French soldier buried in the Arc de Triomphe of the congressional medal of honor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1322), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PORTER, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 425) authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to China, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1323), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HUMPHREYS, from the Committee on Flood Control, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10211) to survey the Yazoo River, Miss., with a view to the control of its floods, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1324), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 16089) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved July 27, 1916, and section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 16090) permitting civilian employees of the War Department to purchase supplies from commissary stores of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16091) for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at or near Shirland Avenue, in the city of Beloit, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLACK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 470) directing the Railroad Labor Board to make further investigation of wages and salaries paid to railway employees under its decisions of July, 1920, and to make such changes and modifications in its said decisions of July, 1920, as it may determine are justified in the public interest and will at the same time award railway employees just and reasonable wages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 471) directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to review its decision of July 29, 1920, granting certain increased rates to common carriers under section 15a of the interstate commerce act, and to make such reduction, if any, in such rates, fares, and charges as it may find to be just and reasonable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Resolution (H. Res. 684) authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs, upon the passage of H. Res. 680, to conduct an investigation concerning the activities of J. M. Hill and C. C. Lindsay in their relations to the War Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring additional appropriations for Federal aid in road building; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of California, relative to the adjusted compensation bill (H. R. 14157); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, asking Congress to declare the Red River of the North a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the State of North Dakota, asking relief for entrymen on the Standing Rock Reservation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the McFadden bill (H. R. 13201); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the emergency tariff legislation (H. R. 15275); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the adjusted compensation bill (H. R. 14157); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the protection of the dairy industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: Memorial of the Legislature of Idaho, requesting Congress to pass Senator McCUMBER's bill providing for monthly payment of pension to soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 16092) for the relief of Lieut. Solomon J. Chapman, jr., Medical Corps, United States Naval Reserve Force, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 16093) granting a pension to Jessie A. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 16094) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 16095) granting a pension to Phebe Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 16096) granting a pension to Edith Z. Pyles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 16097) for the relief of the city of Boston; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 16098) granting a pension to Christina Weaver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 16099) to remove the charge of desertion against George W. Posey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5755. By Mr. BABKA: Petition of T. W. Gould, of a committee representing the employees of the Steamboat-Inspection Service, Cleveland, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 15746 and Senate bill 4839; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5756. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Associated Dairymen of California (Inc.) relative to the tariff on butter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5757. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of citizens of the county of Cumberland, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5758. By Mr. CLEARY: Petition of Laurence L. Cassidy and William E. Davgren and 2,000 citizens of New York, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5759. By Mr. DALE: Petition of certain citizens of Orleans County, Vt., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5760. By Mr. ECHOLS: Petition of citizens of Kanawha County, W. Va., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5761. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the board of directors of the Milk Producers' Association, protesting against any tariff on lumber and building materials imported from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5762. Also, petition of residents of Sauk County, Wis., favoring beer and light wines and protesting against the Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5763. By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Petition of certain citizens of Park County, Mont., protesting against the increased duty on imported tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5764. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Rev. U. Vincent O'Brien, of Mendota, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5765. Also, petition of Chicago District Ice Association, protesting against the Federal live stock commission bill (S. 3944) and the Federal coal bill (S. 4828); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5766. Also, petition of the Rockford (Ill.) Osteopathic Society, suggesting various amendments to the Capper-Fess bill; to the Committee on Education.

5767. Also, petition of 144 citizens of Rockford, Ottawa, and La Salle, Ill., favoring an amendment to the Volstead Act permitting the manufacture of light wines and beer, and protesting against the McKellar Sunday bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5768. Also, petition of L. P. Luby, of Rockford, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5769. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolution of American War Veterans' Association of the City of Boston and County of Suffolk

Employees, Chris C. Mitchell, jr., president, Boston, Mass., favoring passage of the Langley bill (H. R. 15894) to establish hospitals for disabled war veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5770. Also, petition of Universal Winding Co., Boston, Mass., favoring passage of the Nolan bill (H. R. 13681), which seeks to protect the inventors and manufacturers of the United States; to the Committee on Patents.

5771. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of the University Women's Club of the Ohio State University, favoring an appropriation of \$3,500,000 for Army education and vocational training; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5772. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of Michigan Potato Producers' Association, favoring an import duty on potatoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5773. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Engineers' Club and the Crown Cork & Seal Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Nolan patent bill; to the Committee on Patents.

5774. Also, petition of Dr. Charles S. Woodruff, L. C. Steinacker, Miss Rose S. O'Donovan, E. E. Nagle, Miss Eleanor M. O'Donovan, Miss Ella H. Schoolfield, Mrs. Thomas A. Moran, Charles P. Mahaffey, Mrs. Allan Macsherry, Mrs. M. T. Rock, and August Yienger et al., all of Baltimore, Md., opposing Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5775. Also, petition of North Carolina Pine Box & Shook Manufacturers' Association, of Baltimore, Md., opposing Senate bills 3944 and 4828; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5776. By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: Petition of 180 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5777. Also, petition of 500 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5778. Also, petition of 122 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the Fess-Capper physical education bill; to the Committee on Education.

5779. By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Waukesha, Wis., protesting against the action of the grand jury at Milwaukee, Wis., on December 11, 1920, in their decision against the Volstead Act and in favor of beer and wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5780. By Mr. RIDDICK: Petition of citizens of Cascade County, Mont., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5781. Also, petition of farmers of Daniels County, Mont., asking for enactment of legislation providing Federal aid for farmers to enable them to plant crops in the spring of 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5782. Also, petition of residents of Park County, Mont., protesting against the proposed tariff on wrapper tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5783. Also, petition of the Women's Catholic League of Kallspeil, Mont., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5784. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the North Dakota State Legislature, petitioning Congress for the enactment of legislation to declare the Red River of the North a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5785. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing Congress to take immediate action toward furnishing the means whereby the farmers of the drought-stricken regions may have Federal aid in the purchase of seed for the season of 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5786. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Universal Winding Co., of Boston, Mass., on Nolan bill; to the Committee on Patents.

5787. Also, petition of Bay State Dredging & Contracting Co., of Boston, Mass., on House bill 13951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5788. Also, letter from Lamson & Hubbard Co., of Boston, Mass., relative to tariff on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5789. Also, petition of Daggett Chocolate Co., of Boston, Mass., on House bill 10311; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5790. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the Bottineau Post No. 42, American Legion, of Bottineau, N. Dak., and Walter J. Thome Post No. 45, of the American Legion, of Carson, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for increased hospital facilities for disabled veterans and for disability pay for National Army officers, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5791. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of the Engineers Club, of Baltimore, Md., urging the passage of the Nolan Patent Office bill; to the Committee on Patents.